DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 488	SP 020 964

AUTHOR Godbey, Geoffrey; Blazey, Michael
TITLE The Use of Local Parks by Older Residents of Urban Areas.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Recreation and Parks Dept.
SPONS AGENCY NRTA-AARP Andrus Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 158p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Centers; Individual Characteristics; *Leisure Time; Motivation; *Older Adults; Park Design; *Parks; *Participant Satisfaction; Recreational Activities; *Recreational Facilities; *Urban Areas; Urban Culture

ABSTRACT

Local parks in five large cities (San Francisco, Houston, Atlanta, Chicago, Boston) were selected for a study of the use of urban parks by older adults (55 to 65 and over). Interviews were conducted with park users to determine: (1) meaning, motivation, and satisfactions associated with local park usage; (2) factors of usage such as time of day, duration of stay, frequency of use, travel mode, and companionship during usage; (3) on-site behaviors, moods, activities, and states of mind; (4) critiques of the park environment and suggested improvements; and (5) projected future use by elderly and nearly elderly park users. In presenting the major findings of the study, characteristics of the respondents are presented first, followed by an analysis of the extent to which data concerning park use by older citizens varies by city and by age category. Presentations are then made concerning older citizens' general assessment of parks, behavior on site, logistics of use, motivation, and satisfaction. Results of a factor analysis of older park users are also presented. Conclusions drawn from the study are discussed along with considerations of implications for the management of urban recreation and park systems with reference to older people. Appendices contain a copy of the interview questionnaire as well as a description of each of the parks studied. Recommendations are also made for improving methods of conducting future studies on this topic. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221488

The Use of Local Parks by Older Residents of Urban Areas

A Report to the NRTA/AARP Andrus Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Geoffrey Godbey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By Geoffrey Godbey, Ph.D.
and Michael Blazey, M.S.

Recreation and Parks Department
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

(SP 020 964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

OLDER USERS OF PUBLIC URBAN PARKS 1
Statement of Problem 4
Procedures 5
Study Instrument 8
Sampling Procedures 10
Administration of the Interview Schedule 11
Analysis of Data 12

FINDINGS 13
Characteristics of Respondents 14
Variation in Park Use by Age and by City 16
Controlling for Center Use. 18
Controlling for Income 20
Examining Data by Age 20
Controlling for Center Use 21
Controlling for Income 21
General Assessment of Park 22
Behavior on Site 28
Variation in Behavior on Site 29
Logistics of Use 32
Motivation-Satisfaction. 41
Feelings After Visiting Park 43
Summary 46
A Factor Analysis of Older Park users 47
Statistical Treatment 47
Analysis of Data 47
Item Development 48
Factor Analysis 49
Findings 50
Identification of Park Users Type 53
Summary 54

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE 58

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Responses to Interview Schedule by Number and Percentage 63

Appendix B: Field Director's Travel Report 71
San Francisco 77
Site 1: Crocker-Amazon Playground 77
Site 2: Mission Delores 77
Site 3: Washington Square 77
Site 4: Alta Plaza 78
Site 5: Muscone Recreation Center 78

Page

Houston 79
  Site 6: Mason Park 79
  Site 7: Fleming Park 79
  Site 8: Independence Heights 79
  Site 9: Candlelight Park 80
  Site 10: Clark Park 80

Atlanta 81
  Site 11: Lang Carson 81
  Site 12: Pittman Park 81
  Site 13: Perkerson Park 81
  Site 14: West Manor 81
  Site 15: Mozley Park 82

Chicago 83
  Site 16: Tuley Park 83
  Site 17: Avalon Park 83
  Site 18: Welles Park 83
  Site 19: Shabbona Park 84
  Site 20: Hiawatha Park 84

Boston 85
  Site 21: Herter Park 85
  Site 22: Columbus Park 85
  Site 23: Gibson Playground 85
  Site 24: The Back Bay Fens 85
  Site 25: Chestnut Hill 86

Appendix C: Sample Interview Schedule 87

Appendix D: Coding Scheme - Condensed 94

Appendix E: Coding Scheme - Expanded 100

Appendix F: Interviewer's Samping and Photography Instructions 134

Appendix G: Items and Z-Scores Greater or Less Than Corresponding Array Z's 148

OLDER USERS OF PUBLIC URBAN PARKS

Local parks are a common feature of urban American life. In many communities in the United States, one acre of every ten is parkland (Haley, 1979). "Neighborhood parks have become increasingly valuable to the city as a bit of nature, a refuge, a pause, a reminder of simple things, an outdoor meeting center, a play area for children, a drama in people watching, and especially for ethnic groups from warm climates, a necessity for day-to-day socializing and display" (Kaplan, 1979). Parks theoretically provide the opportunity for a roleless experience in which one's status is of little importance.

If local parks are conceived of as places developed exclusively for participation in highly active forms of "outdoor recreation", then it may be expected that individuals would be increasingly less likely to use local parks as they grow older. Analyses of a national survey of participation in thirty outdoor recreation activities by Godbey and Robinson (1979) and Kelly (1979) show that age and lifestage respectively are predictive of participation in outdoor recreation and that as people age or enter later stages of life they are increasingly less likely to participate in outdoor recreation. Godbey and Robinson found that age had a higher predictive value than any other socioeconomic variable examined. The activities showing the weakest relations with age were golf, sightseeing, pleasure driving and nature walks. Other research undertaken by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (1962), Sessoms (1963) the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (1965, 1972), and others have generally confirmed that participation in most forms of outdoor recreation declines with age.

In spite of declining participation in outdoor recreation activities, it is not at all certain that such decline with age is evident in the usage of local parks. Gold (1969), for instance, found little variance in the likelihood of local park usage associated with age. A study of the membership of urban older people who were members of the National Retired Teacher's Association/American Association of Retired Persons (1979) found that forty-eight percent of the members surveyed had visited a local park within the last year although only eight percent went a few times a week or more.

Godbey and Robinson found that older residents were less likely than average to have parks and other outdoor recreation areas within fifteen minutes of their houses, but such differences were not pronounced. Thus, while older people generally have lower rates of participation in outdoor recreation than younger people, a large percentage visit local parks or have access to them.

There is a danger in assuming that the "purpose" of neighborhood parks is to "actively" participate in preconceived activities such as softball or jogging. If neighborhood parks are to be understood in terms of their current contribution and potential contribution in enriching the lives of the elderly, different types of research must take place. Such investigation must recognize what Neugarten (1979) refers to as the increasing "interiority" of later life and avoid a simple frequency of the participation approach. This method simply asks participants what activities they undertake and then stratifies participants by socioeconomic status. For an older population, park "activity" may be thinking, reminiscing, quiet games, or watching children. Any study which attempts to examine the role of park use in the lives of elderly people must find out what elderly park users are thinking and feeling as well as doing. Such a study would need to avoid a strictly quantitative approach and deal with qualitative aspects as well. As Kelly (1980) stated, "the foremost value of the qualitative study of leisure is that leisure is studied with methods that correspond to its nature. If leisure is defined as a qualitative experience rather than designated time or activities, the data that omits meaning, satisfaction, social definitions and other elements of the quality of the experience may deal only with indices and contents rather than with leisure itself." Remarkably little is known about why the elderly use neighborhood parks, the role of such usage in their lives, what they think about, what the elderly feel and do on-site, with whom they participate and how they would change the park to provide a more satisfactory experience. In short, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge regarding the "how" and "why" of local park usage among the elderly and the soon to be elderly.

Historically, local parks in this country have been designed almost exclusively to serve the needs of young people, both in park layout and design and in activity offerings. Clarence Rainwater, historian of the play movement in the United States, documented a fundamental change in functional orientation embraced by these new smaller parks; "from the prevailing idea of the city park as a "breathing place" where "one could do little else" the three-to-ten acre park became the "play park" providing a setting for the public playground" (CPL, 1977). In some countries, such as Britain, local parks have incorporated elderly usage patterns in their design as well as those of the young. Such an approach has been largely ignored in this country.

As increased energy costs make the urban elderly increasingly dependent upon nearby leisure resources and as our country collectively ages, public park officials will have to consider changes in order to serve the needs and desires of the elderly and the near elderly. To do so, park planners must understand the meaning of local park experience in the elderly person's life. Because this segment of the population experiences changes which render them increasingly more dependent on and aware of their physical environment, understanding the elderly person's park experience must consider the environment in which behavior takes place as well as the behavior and its consequences (Proppe, 1968). Examining the local park environment and its meaning to the elderly user is a first step toward making local parks more relevant to the leisure needs and desires of the elderly.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to examine selected aspects of local park usage by older urban residents. Specifically, the study examined:

(1) the meaning, motivation and satisfactions associated with local park usage

(2) factors of usage such as time of day, duration of stay, frequency of use, travel mode and companionship during usage

(3) on-site behaviors, moods, activities and states of mind

(4) critiques of the park environment and suggested improvements and

(5) projected future use by elderly and nearly elderly park users.

Procedures

In an exploratory study such as this, emphasis was placed on learning as much about the elderly park users and their experiences while in the park as possible. The first major decision was where the research should take place. After reviewing many cities' park designs and systems, it was discovered that there was no such thing as a "typical park" in which to start the research. As Dunn (1974) stated, cities vary greatly in amount of park acreage, the conditions of such areas, programs conducted on such areas, and the accessibility of such areas.

The choice of locations incorporated many factors such as seasons and weather (since outdoor recreation is involved), attitude variation in the different regions, population concentrations and geography. It was decided to use the cities of San Francisco, Houston, Atlanta, Chicago and Boston. These cities are used many times for test marketing because their population and characteristics are similar to regional and/or national levels (King, 1967).

The next step was to develop a research team in each city. Due to the high costs of travel and lodging, a research team was developed in each city, consisting of a university professor who was skilled in recreation and park research and two interviewers. The professor was responsible for providing information about the city and its park system, advising in hiring, training and supervising the interviewers, "trouble-shooting" and transmitting the finished interview schedules back to the project and field directors. The academic consultants for this study were:

The Use of Local Parks By Urban Elderly
Consultant List

City	Consultant
San Francisco	Professor Ginny Jaquith Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies San Francisco State University 1600 Holloway San Francisco, CA 94132
Houston	Dr. Dan Kamp Department of Recreation and Parks Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77843
Chicago	Professor Lisa Raymond Chicago State University 95th at Martin Luther King Drive Chicago, IL 60417
Atlanta	Dr. Charles Exley Department of HPER Georgia State University 33 Gilmer Street Atlanta, GA 30303
Boston	Dr. Jay McMillen Recreation and Leisure Studies Northeastern University 360 Huntington Avenue Boston, MA 02115

Once the park sites were selected (see the sampling procedures), the consultant identified both social and physical characteristics of the parks, the activities scheduled, and preliminary user patterns and characteristics. Since the consultant was a professor of Recreation and Parks, he/she was able to easily obtain and interpret this information. The consultant made initial contact with the Recreation and Parks Director for the city or related officials to secure permission and obtain information needed. This proved to be a time-saving and low cost method of identifying reliable information so that the field director was better prepared to enter the individual cities to train the interviewers, pilot test the interview schedule in each city, and explain the exact procedures to be followed to the consultant. The consultant in each city assisted in interviewer training, received the daily reports from the interviewers, and consulted with the Project and Field Directors. Consultants also made visits in the field so spot check the interviewers' performance. The consultant was also responsible for assisting the interviewers in taking one-hundred usable slides depicting the sites used for interviewing and critiquing the final report.

In order to provide consistency in interview procedures, the Field Director traveled from city to city and trained all of the interviewers with methods developed prior to the start of training. See Appendix B - Field Director's Travel Report. The interview consisted of a face-to-face verbal interchange in which the interviewer attempted to elicit information or expressions of opinion or beliefs from the respondent in regard to the respondent's assessment of the park, logistics of park use, behavior on site, motivation for and satisfaction with park experience, and socioeconomic statuses. It was a goal of the training of the interviewers that they became familiar enough with the questions and the measures used in the interview to speak in a conversational manner with the respondent, yet keep the original words and meanings intended. Extensive care was taken to eliminate ambiguities in the questions without unduly sacrificing the language and style appropriate to an elderly population (Havighurst, 1976).

The Field Director was responsible for final determination of whether the people selected for the job fit the determined necessary characteristics and resembled the interviewers in the other cities. The consultants in each city were initially sent a list of characteristics each interviewer should possess in order to maximize interviewer similarities.

Study Instrument

The study instrument used in this research was an interview schedule used on site to obtain information concerning park users. This method was chosen based on the population being interviewed and the type of information wanted. The personal interview is widely used in research pertaining to the elderly. According to Zelan (1969) "a researcher need have no fear in embarking on a survey of the aged persons if he knows them to be in reasonably good health, and if the topic of research is one that touches them personally." Havighurst (1976) found elderly respondents to interviews almost universally warm and friendly once they understood the purpose of the study. In exploratory research, the answers to the questions asked are not always known and therefore cannot easily be put into mail questionnaire form. Interviewing solves this problem by allowing the questions asked to be open-ended, thus letting the interviewer probe and clarify an elderly respondent's answers. The interviewer may be able to get a respondent to answer some questions they may not on a written questionnaire. This method also helps those elderly who may not be able to read or write for various reasons.

In gerontological research and practice, there has been a tendency to deemphasize the role of the environmental contexts in understanding elderly behavior (Rebok and Hoyer, 1977). Examining isolated behavior is likely to be insufficient, however, since there is an intercorrelation between settings and behavior. Since relatively little is known about this linkage between the elderly individual, his behavior and the physical and social setting, it will be a focus of this study. In order to design and plan for the elderly user, the process must involve him directly. By interviewing on site, the respondent was thought to be better able to interpret his or her park behavior.

The interview schedule was designed after a review of related literature and after informal consultation with a number of urban park researchers, such as Professor William Burch of Yale University and Professor Seymour Gold of the University of California at Davis. Although the most closely related study--Central City Parks: A Behavioral Perspective by Thomas A. More (December, 1980: U.S. Forest Service)--was not available to the researchers until after this study was nearly completed, the similarity of findings was remarkable.

After initial critiquing of the initially developed instrument by faculty members and graduate students at The Pennsylvania State University, the instrument was finalized after pilot testing and revisions. Pilot testing occurred in March, 1981 with approximately 20 respondents at public parks in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (through the courtesy of Robert Crawford, Recreation Commissioner) and identified problems with length and clarity of the instrument. The instrument was subsequently revised to remove non-essential items, clarify misunderstood questions and simplify the response format. The revised version was tested during interviewer training in San

Francisco with only minor changes regarding interviewer recording necessitated.

The final interview schedule, which was administered by trained interviewers, contained the following sections. (A complete copy of the instrument is presented in Appendix C.)

a. Information regarding date and time of the interview and number of persons accompanying the interviewee.

b. Questions concerning who the park was perceived as being for, if the interviewee knew the other people who used the park, if they felt comfortable with the other people who used the park, if the park was maintained, what the interviewee perceived as being the usual activities of people their age, if they thought the park was safe, how often they came to the park, if they had used the park in past years and how many years, what time they usually came and for how long; interviewees were also asked why they came at a usual time. Weekday or weekend use preference was also asked and why the particular preference was indicated. Interviewees were asked if visits were planned in advance or were spur of the moment decisions; if planned in advance, they were asked how far ahead planning was done. Respondents were asked how far they lived from the park and how they usually traveled to the site. They were asked if they came accompanied by someone. Questions concerning the role of the park in their lives and if they felt differently after their park visit.

c. A set of questions concerning park uses and potential uses were asked. Interviewees were asked what they usually did at the park. They were asked if there was anything they usually did at the park. They were asked if there was anything they couldn't do at the park, but would like to do. Finally they were asked if there was anything about the park they would change and why.

d. Demographic questions. This section contained questions on gender, health, marital status, race or ethnic background, employment status, age, income, and educational level. These factors were included to serve as control variables to prevent spurious deductions from the data analysis.

Sampling Procedures

The academic consultants in each city were instructed in late February, 1981 to contact an official of the city's Park and Recreation Authority to obtain permission to conduct the study and to select seven park sites meeting the study criteria. The sites were to be from 5 to 100 acre parks, designed to serve a neighborhood area. Five of the seven recommended sites were to be chosen by the field director for inclusion in the study. The field director's report (Appendix B) details the review and selection process in each city.

Specific instructions for identifying and approaching potential respondents on site were emphasized heavily during interviewer training. The instructions may be found in Appendix F.

Several sampling changes became necessary during and after interviewer training in three of the cities. Large numbers of persons visiting parks in Houston, Chicago, and Atlanta were coming to participate in programs offered in recreation centers. Therefore, persons on the premises for program reasons were interviewed if they qualified in terms of the age requirements. This decision meant that a park user was defined only as one who was physically on the premises, regardless of motivation or behavior.

Weekend data collection was curtailed in Houston and Atlanta for reasons specific to each community. In Houston, large numbers of Mexican-American youth frequented the parks, resulting in little park use by the older citizens. Atlanta elderly park users have traditionally had other obligations on weekends, such as church and family events. The interviewers in both cities were instructed to obtain those weekend interviews which were possible and make up the shortfall on weekdays.

Administration of the Interview Schedule

The instrument was administered by one or two trained interviewers in the five cities selected. The methods used in selecting respondents and in administering the instrument are discussed further under sampling procedures. (Appendix F)

Coding of the responses for data analysis was handled by both the interviewer and the directors. Fixed-response items were coded immediately by the interviewer. Open-ended question responses were recorded by the interviewer and a coding scheme later developed by the directors. Coding was then completed at The Pennsylvania State University.

Analysis of Data

Once all data were coded, a number of analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, including descriptive statistics and frequencies, chi-square and analysis of variance. Specifically, the chi-square test was used to examine variation in response to each question by city and by age group (55-65, over 65). Analysis of variance was utilized to examine these same relationships while controlling for the effect of senior citizen center use and income respectively upon the observed relationships.

Finally, a Q-type factor analysis was undertaken utilizing many variables from the interview to explore whether a lesser number of variables would emerge to better explain park use.

FINDINGS

The following represent the major findings of this study. Characteristics of respondents are presented first. Next, the extent to which all data concerning park use by older citizens varies by city and by age category (55-65, over 65) is examined. After that, detailed presentations are made concerning older citizens general assessment of their park, behavior on site, logistics of use and motivation-satisfaction. Finally, the results of a factor analysis of older park users is presented.

Characteristics of Respondents

Usable personal interviews were completed with a total of 695 subjects including 149 from San Francisco, 121 from Houston, 125 from Atlanta, 147 from Chicago and 151 from Boston. While the hope was to obtain 150 interviews in each city, these totals represent the total number of interviews which could be obtained within the scheduled date collection period. Since the refusal rate among potential respondents was only two percent, lack of cooperation was not a problem. Several interviewers reported that the number of people age 55 and over within several park sites was limited and that these totals represented all the respondents available given the time period for interviews.

As may be seen in Table One, some characteristics of respondents, such as marital, gender and health status, varied greatly from city to city. This was to be expected, since in each city the sample was obtained from only five park sites. When not stratified by city or park site, however, the sample appears to be highly heterogeneous.

In terms of gender, 48 percent of the sample was male and 52 percent was female. Only eight percent described their health status as below average or poor. Slightly less than half of the 695 subjects were currently married with a surviving spouse; 34 percent were widowed.

Racially, Blacks represented 27 percent of the population, whites 67 percent, Mexican-Americans 3 percent, with the remaining 3 percent a mixture of ethnic backgrounds

In terms of employment status, almost seven out of ten respondents were retired and only about one in ten was employed full time, with another one in ten being full-time homemakers.

Six out of ten respondents were above the age of 65 with all others from ages 55-65.

TABLE ONE. GENDER, HEALTH AND MARITAL STATUS BY CITY

Gender

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Male	15	19	66	99	43	62	40	48	67	99
Female	85	105	34	52	57	81	60	73	33	48

Health Status

	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Excellent	8	10	21	30	10	14	19	23	24	34
Good	58	70	35	50	23	32	48	58	43	62
Average	29	35	36	51	53	75	28	34	26	37
Poor	5	6	8	11	14	20	5	6	8	11

Marital Status

	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Married	36	45	47	70	43	62	65	76	53	78
Never Married	0	0	19	28	48	7	0	0	12	18
Divorced	1	1	8	12	15	21	5	6	5	8
Separated	0	0	2	3	4	6	0	0	2	3
Widowed	63	79	24	36	31	47	30	36	26	39
Don't Know	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2

Income is always a sensitive area of questioning in personal interviews, particularly with older adults. In this study, 25 percent of the respondents did not know or would not divulge their income. Of the remaining 75 percent, incomes were broadly distributed. Ten percent reported incomes of under $4,000 a year, 18 percent had incomes from $4,000 to $8,000, 16 percent stated their income was from $8,000 to $12,000, 13 percent reported incomes from $12,000 to $17,000, 8 percent had incomes from $17,000 to $25,000 and 11 percent had incomes of $25,000 and over.

As might be expected, since income levels were diverse, levels of formal education also varied greatly. Approximately 12 percent of those sampled had completed no more than sixth grade, 17 percent had completed between seven and nine years of public school, 12 percent had completed some high school, 24 percent had graduated from high school, 25 percent had a bachelor's degree or at least some college, seven percent had a post-graduate degree or some graduate work and 3 percent didn't know, wouldn't answer or gave another response.

Socio-economic statuses varied greatly among cities. In Atlanta, for instance, 85 percent of the respondents were female while in San Francisco only 33 percent were. While 24 percent of San Francisco's respondents said they were in excellent health, only 8 percent of Atlanta's respondents replied similarly.

Variation in Park Use by Age and by City

While variation in park usage patterns among older people by age and by city will be discussed in detail later, the following table (Table Two) provides an overview of data in regard to these variables. Specifically, the table shows whether variation in response to interview questions varies among respondents more than could have occurred by chance among respondents in

	CHI SQUARE BY CITY	ANOVA CITY CONTROL CENTER NON-CENTER	ANOVA CITY CONTROL INCOME	CHI SQUARE BY AGE	ANOVA AGE, CENTER NON-CENTER	ANOVA AGE, INCOME	CRAMER'S V		QUESTIONS	
							CITY	AGE		
* Q 1									Would you say park is for people of all ages?	*
* Q 3	.0000	.0000	.000	.2480	.487	.084	.27971	.07837	Of other users, who would you say you know personally?	*
* Q 4	.0000	.0000	.000	.9391	.897	.353	.28886	.00781	Do you feel comfortable with other park users?	*
* Q 5	.0000	.0000	.000	.2456	.440	.032	.28382	.07979	Why do you say that?	*
* Q 6	.0000	.0000	.000	.4301	.112	.811	.36117	.03450	Overall, is this park well-maintained and taken care of?	*
* Q 7	.0000	.123	.313	.5540	.029	.160	.23641	.04202	Why do you think that?	*
@ Q 8	.0000	.518	.308	.0123	.037	.219	.27684	.14019	What do people in your age range like to do while here?	@
@ Q 8A	.0000	.570	.446	.0208	.408	.763	.24889	.15952	What do people in your age range like to do while here?	@
@ Q 8B	.0001	.046	.157	.2991	.872	.564	.26321	.10290	What do people in your age range like to do while here?	@
@ Q 8C	.	.949	.441	.9981	.876	.780		.00685	What do people in your age range like to do while here?	@
* Q 9	.0000	.0000	.000	.1792	.971	.510	.40337	.07132	Do you think this park is safe?	*
* Q10	.0000	.0000	.000	.1895	.670	.185	.21888	.09720	Why do you think that?	*
X Q11	.0000	.0000	.000	.0000	.143	.801	.26802	.23829	How often do you come to this park?	X
X Q12	.0092	.001	.032	.0056	.010	.070	.14156	.11350	Have you used this park in past years?	X
X Q14	.0000	.000	.002	.0049	.012	.028	.28238	.16482	What time of day do you usually come here?	X
X Q15	.0000	.002	.000	.0049	.183	.017	.28029	.18351	How long do you usually stay?	X
X Q16	.0000	.000	.000	.0144	.943	.039	.32492	.16054	Why do you come to the park at (usual time)?	X
X Q17	.0000	.206	.006	.0321	.072	.020	.30062	.10155	Do you prefer to come to the park on weekends or weekdays?	X
X Q18	.0000	.000	.000	.0007	.228	.012	.39314	.20929	Why preference, if given?	X
X Q19	.0000	.000	.000	.8577	.479	.706	.41390	.02166	Do you plan your visit in advance or decide on spur of moment?	X
X Q20	.0000	.003	.000	.0012	.059	.026	.27556	.23160	If planned, how far in advance?	X
X Q21	.0000	.000	.000	.1507	.846	.461	.22511	.11173	How far do you live from the park?	X
X Q22	.0000	.388	.351	.0000	.394	.300	.22872	.22697	How do you usually travel to the park?	X
X Q23	.0000	.000	.013	.0433	.008	.888	.27530	.12883	Who do you usually come with?	X
# Q24	.0000	.019	.148	.0062	.038	.371	.27400	.17605	What role does the park play in your life?	#
# Q24A	.0055	.246	.159	.7392	.192	.403	.12510	.02983	What role does the park play in your life?	#
# Q25	.0166	.263	.328	.1013	.322	.829	.11706	.08249	Do you feel differently about things after your visit?	#
# Q26	.0001	.000	.023	.4208	.265	.297	.27807	.05750	Can you describe those feelings?	#
@ Q27	.0000	—	.000	.7381	—	.002	.26762	.06371	What do you usually do when you come to the park?	@
@ Q27A	.0000	—		.2465	—		.24002	.11774	What do you usually do when you come to the park?	@
# Q28	.0034	.001	.006	.7348	.560	.873	.15332	.01865	Is there anything you'd like to do, but can't?	#
& Q32	.0000	.000	.000	.1314	.363	.446	.37870	.06100	Sex	&
& Q33	.0000	.000	.007	.0003	.000	.230	.18353	.17000	Health	&
& Q34	.0000	.000	.008	.0000	.000	.000	.26818	.29730	Marital Status	&
& Q35	.0000	.000	.000	.0021	.042	.022	.48998	.13491	Race	&
& Q36	.0000	.022	.027	.0000	.000	.000	.16511	.41375	Employment Status	&
& Q38	.0000	.000		.0000	.000		.25420	.30487	Income	&
& Q39	.0000	.000	.000	.0000	.000	.007	.17732	.25684	Education	&

CODE: * = Assessment; X = Logistics; # = Motivation/Satisfaction; @ = Behavior on site; & = Socio-economic status.
Underlining indicates statistical significance at the .01 level.

TABLE TWO

VARIATION IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS BY CITY AND BY AGE GROUP (55-65 and over 65)[a]

[a] Chi-square tests were utilized to test significance of relation between each question and city and each questions and age. Analysis of variance was used to examine these relations when the effect of center usage and income level of respondents was held constant. Cramer's V reports comparative strength of relationships.

different cities or in different age groups (55-65, over 65). Our concern here is whether or not we may generalize as to the park usage patterns for older users in various cities and whether we may generalize about such usage patterns for all those 55 years old and over or whether we must consider those over 65 as different from those 55-65. These questions are important, since they help us to understand how inclusively we may plan for the local park needs of older citizens. For instance, may we plan for older people's park needs in Boston using data from Atlanta? Must we plan separately for "Senior Citizens?"

Let us examine Table Two. The first row of figures shows the results of Chi-Square tests for each question (except question one where there was almost no variation in response) using city as the independent variable and the question variable as the dependent variable. For example, if we examine Question 3 in the first column--Chi-Square by City--we are asking - Is the variation in the extent to which older park users in different cities feel comfortable with other park users greater than could have occurred by chance? In rejecting the notion that there was no difference among cities, we are likely to be wrong less than one time out of one hundred.

If we examine the rest of the column, we see that variation among cities for nearly every question was greater than could have occurred by chance. The one exception is Question 25--Do you feel differently about things after your visit? Thus, even without controlling for intervening variables, there is no statistically significant difference here if we utilize the .01 confidence level, although the level is very close.

Controlling for Center Use

Our next step was to consider that some of this variation in response among older park users in different cities may have been due to the fact that in some cities older park users were more likely to have been users of senior citizen centers in the park than in other cities. In other words, the variation in feeling comfortable with other park users among older people in the various cities may not be attributable to city differences as such, but rather due to the fact that older park users in, for instance, Atlanta, were more likely to use senior citizen centers than older park users in Boston. Since an older person is more likely to feel comfortable with other senior citizen center users than with park users in general, the difference in senior citizen center use rather than the difference in city may be the underlying cause of the observed difference by city.

In column two, ANOVA City-Control Center Non-Center, we have utilized analysis of variance tests to examine the relation between cities and response to each question after controlling the influence of center use on that relationship. Now a different picture emerges. Now we see that for most Behavior on Site questions and for most Motivation-Satisfaction question there is no difference among cities. In other words, in regard to behavior on site and motivation-satisfaction, older park users in different cities are similar if we control the influence of using senior citizen centers.

In some areas however, we see that statistically significant differences remain among older park users even after controlling for the influence of center use. The Assessment of parks and the Logistics of use tend to be different among older users in different cities. Our belief here is that these differences don't reflect inherent attitudinal and behavioral differences but rather the fact that some parks were "better than others" e.g., maintenance, safety, and that variables impacting upon logistics of use, e.g., public transportation system, vary for each city.

In summary then, if we remove the impact of recreation center use, older park visitors in various cities are similar in behavior and motivation-satisfaction.

Controlling for Income

When we stratify older park users by city and control the impact of the income of such users (but not center use) the results are very similar to the previously found results which controlled for center use but not income. That is, users among various cities are not significantly different with regard to behavior on site or motivation-satisfaction but do vary in regard to assessment and logistics of use. Since those who use senior citizen centers tend to be lower income individuals, the similarity of results found in the two series of analyses of variance shouldn't be surprising.

Examining Data by Age

A second independent variable which was examined in terms of its impact upon response to all interview questions was age of respondent. Our concern here was specifically whether those who were older and more likely to have retired or live alone (over age 65) were different from those who were younger, less likely to live alone and to have retired.

Observe the column entitled Chi-Square by Age. Here, age has been treated as an independent variable and each interview question as the dependent variable in order to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference in response between the two age groups. As may be seen, the only area of questioning where such significant difference was found was logistics of use (and Question 24 in motivation-satisfaction). This finding seems of great importance since it shows that park users over 65 don't vary in terms of their assessment of the park, their motivation-satisfaction, or their behavior on site.

Controlling for Center Use

When we examine the relation between age category and response to each question, controlling the impact of use of senior citizen centers, we find almost no difference between the two age groups. Only Question 12--Have you used this park in past years? and Question 23--Who do you usually come with? Here we would expect difference in response based solely upon older people having lived longer at the same residence and being more likely to have lost a spouse.

The rather amazing implication here is that one need not plan and manage neighborhood parks giving separate consideration to those over 65 but may plan more inclusively for older users (those 55 and over).

Controlling for Income

When income is used as a control variable in the relationship between age category and each interview question, we again find almost all relations between age category and interview questions are not statistically significant. That is, variation in response between age groups is not greater than could have occurred by chance. The only exceptions here are Question 18 "Why?" (Do you have a preference for visiting the park on weekdays or weekends?) and Question 27--What do you usually do when you come to the park? These differences are likely to have occurred because center use was not controlled for here and those over 65 years or older are more likely to use centers, and to use them on weekdays.

General Assessment of Park

Older users were asked eight questions (Q 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9) to determine their evaluation of the park's quality of maintenance, safety, intended users and the characteristics of actual users.

Respondents overwhelmingly (96%) believed that the parks they were in were for everyone. Variation of response by city ranged from 100 percent in Atlanta to 92.5 percent in Chicago.

Of the three percent who said the parks were not for everyone, most responded that they felt the park was for younger people.

When asked if they knew the users of the park in which they were interviewed, a majority, 60 percent, said they didn't know any of them or only a few of them. Twenty-seven percent said they knew "some" of the other users while 12 percent said they knew most of them. Variation in response by city was extensive (Chi square = .00) and is probably partially attributable to the fact that in Atlanta two of the parks surveyed had senior citizen programs housed in recreation centers on the park site. For instance, in Atlanta, only two percent of the respondents said they didn't know any other users while in Boston 42 percent didn't know any other users. (See Table Three)

As may be seen in Table One, Question Three (Q3), when the impact of intervening variables, attending a recreation center in the park and income, were controlled through separate analysis of variance, the variation in knowing other users by city remained statistically greater than could have occurred by chance.

Older park users were also asked if they felt comfortable with the other people who used the park. Eighty-six percent of all respondents said they did feel comfortable with other people who used the park, 10 percent said they felt safe with some of the users or sometimes felt safe and 3 percent said

TABLE THREE. OTHER USERS KNOWN TO RESPONDENT BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	2	2	41	63	16	23	18	22	28	42
Few	21	26	42	64	47	69	38	45	39	59
Some	63	77	13	19	19	28	27	33	20	30
Most	15	18	3	5	18	26	17	20	11	17
Other Answer	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2

they did not feel comfortable. Again, there was considerable variation in response by city. Perhaps surprisingly, Atlanta, where the killer of a large number of Black children was on the loose at the time of the interviews, had the highest percentage of respondents who felt comfortable with other users, 99 percent. In San Francisco, conversely, only 71 percent said they felt comfortable.

The intervening variables of attending a recreation center in the park and income were again measured for their impact by using separate analyses of variance for each. The relationship between city and feeling comfortable remained significant in both cases, affirming the strong variation among the cities with regard to older users sense of comfort with other users.

In a related question, respondents were asked if the park they were in was safe. Only 65 percent gave an unqualified yes. Twenty-one percent said it was sometimes safe and six percent said it was not safe. Eight percent either didn't know or gave some other answer. San Francisco park users were much less likely to think their park was safe than those in other cities. Only four out of ten San Franciscians said their park was safe. (See Table Four)

The variation between the cities also remained significant when the intervening variables of attending a recreation center in the park and income were controlled through separate analyses of variance.

In response to a question concerning maintenance, approximately three out of four (76%) respondents said their park was well maintained. A negative reply was given by 13 percent while the remainder did not know or gave some other response. Again, variation of response by city was great. Twenty-seven percent of San Francisco users said their park was not well maintained while

TABLE FOUR. PERCEPTION OF PARK SAFETY BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Park Safe	76	93	52	79	78	113	88	105	40	59
Park Unsafe	4	5	3	5	6	9	2	2	15	22
Sometimes	2	3	35	53	11	16	10	12	40	59
Other Answer	12	15	9	13	0	0	0	0	3	5
Don't Know	6	7	1	2	5	7	1	1	3	4

less than one percent of Atlanta users and only 2.5 percent of Houston users so replied. (See Table Five)

Once again the potentially intervening variables of attending a recreation center in the park and income were controlled for through separate analyses of variance to determine if they affected the variation of responses between cities with regard to perception of park maintenance. Neither variable influenced the effect of city; therefore, the variation was determined to remain significant.

When respondents were asked why they thought their park was/wasn't safe or was/wasn't well maintained, their answers were generally based upon specific evidence from their own personal experience in the park.

TABLE FIVE. PERCEPTION OF PARK MAINTENANCE BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Park Maintained	94	118	70	107	72	101	93	113	56	84
Park Not Maintained	1	1	14	22	18	26	2	3	27	40
Other Answer	2	2	14	21	4	6	3	4	15	23
Don't Know	3	4	1	2	6	8	1	1	1	2

Behavior on Site

Respondents were asked what they did when they came to the park and what people their age liked to do when they came to the park. (See Table Six) In regard to personal activities, respondents were first asked what they usually did when they came to the park and then asked if they did "anything else." If responses to the questions and follow-up probe are combined, 52 percent participated in a specific non-sport activity, 36 percent said they relaxed, 35 percent said they socialized or visited, 27 percent said they exercised or participated in a sport, 22 percent said they spectated, 8 percent reported they enjoyed nature and small percentages gave other answers. As is evident, these on site behaviors are diverse and appear to be undertaken in response to a variety of human needs. Perhaps most surprising is that 8 out of 10 respondents reported that they participated in a sport or non-sport activity. Such activities were quite diverse and included, for example, picnicking, dancing, gardening, visiting senior centers, feeding birds, singing, walking, hitting golf balls, tennis, and swimming. Thus, the notion of the old person confined to the park bench is very misleading. Even among those over 65, 25 percent exercised or participated in a sport activity (compared to 31 percent for those aged 55-64) and 56 percent participated in a non-sport activity (compared to 49 percent for the 55-64 age group).

As might be expected, activity undertaken varied greatly among cities.[1] This may be partially attributed to variation in weather, park facilities, the presence of senior citizen programs at some parks, and the demographic make-up of older users in various cities.[2]

---

[1] (chi square = .0000)

[2] When the intervening variable of income was controlled for by analysis of variance, the relationship between city and response to what activities an individual engaged in, the significance was maintained.

Respondents, when asked what people in their age range liked to do when they came to the park, were more likely to mention sport and exercise than any other answer--39 percent. Non-physical games and hobbies were mentioned by 21 percent, socializing by 11 percent and sitting or watching by 10 percent. Thus, they were more likely to say that people in their age group exercised and less likely to mention participation in a non-sport activity or sitting and relaxing than this study found people aged 55 and over actually did. Results of this question varied greatly by city and age.

Those over 65 were among those twice as likely to mention a non-physical game or hobby while those age 55-65 were almost twice as likely to mention sport or exercise. Variation in response among different cities was huge. For example, 62 percent in San Francisco mentioned sport or exercise while only eight percent did so in Atlanta. In Boston, 18 percent mentioned sitting or watching while only four percent did so in Houston.

Variation in Behavior on Site By City, Age and Park Site. Chi square tests showed that, while the difference between those 55-65 and over 65 was statistically significant in terms of what they said people in their age group liked to do, there was no significant difference in what they actually did on site. Thus, for the activity categories used for this study, there was a great continuity of park behavior between both age groups.

In regard to differences among cities, both activities personally engaged in and activities ascribed to others in the respondents' age group showed more variation than could have occurred by chance. However, when the potentially intervening variables of attending a recreation center while in the park and income were controlled through separate analysis of variance, the variation

TABLE SIX. PARK USER ACTIVITIES BY CITIES AND AGE

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Participate in Specific Sport Activity or Exercise	9	10	32	47	29	38	19	21	40	56
Participate in Specific Non-Sport Activity	81	86	25	37	48	58	90	90	39	52
Socialize	39	32	26	36	41	47	37	36	36	46
Relax	2	2	66	96	36	46	1	1	43	58
Enjoy Nature	0	0	9	13	8	7	6	4	13	17
Spectate	11	12	33	47	24	26	15	11	22	27
Conduct Business	23	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Eat	27	22	5	7	2	2	10	9	2	2
Drink	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	3
Contemplation	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Answer	1	1	4	6	10	10	20	17	2	3

	55-65		66 and over	
	%	N	%	N
Participate in Specific Sport Activity or Exercise	31	77	25	93
Participate in Specific Non-Sport Activity	50	119	56	197
Socialize	32	71	36	117
Relax	38	86	31	110
Enjoy Nature	9	20	6	19
Spectate	20	44	24	77
Conduct Business	2	5	6	22
Eat	7	16	9	26
Drink	3	5	0	0
Contemplation	0	0	2	6
Other Answer	8	16	6	21

among the cities was no longer insignificant. It might, therefore, be reasoned that attending a recreation center program could influence a respondent's perception of what others in their age group prefer to do. Income may also have a determining influence on those same perceptions, especially where a cost may be involved for certain activities such as ceramics.

LMs13/94

Logistics of Use

Older users of urban parks were asked questions pertaining to the frequency, scheduling, duration, mode of travel and related aspects of park use.

Perhaps the most important finding here is that the majority of older park users are likely to use parks on a frequent basis, in a routine systematic fashion. The majority of users come more than once a week, have a regular time of day when they come, stay a usual amount of time, have a preference for weekends or weekdays, plan their visit in advance and have used the same park for many years. Park use, in short, is less a break from routine than a part of routine.

In regard to frequency of visitation, 13 percent of the sample used the park once or twice a day while another 19 percent used the park nearly every day and 25 percent used it a few times a week. Eighteen percent used the park once a week. While San Francisco park users were more likely than others to say their parks were not safe and not well maintained, they were also more likely than those in other cities to use their parks on a daily basis, with over one-third of all users saying they did so. Conversely, among Atlantans, who were not as critical, only three percent of all users used the parks daily. These results are in keeping with those of other recreation surveys which show that frequent users of recreation areas are likely to be more critical of them than infrequent users.

When asked what time of day they usually visited the park, only 19 percent said they did not visit at a usual time. Late morning was the time most frequently cited (27 percent) while early morning was second (16 percent). In Houston, perhaps owing to the hot weather, 37 percent of all respondents said they usually visited the park in early morning. (See Table Seven)

TABLE SEVEN. USUAL TIME OF PARK VISIT BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Early Morning (7-10 a.m.)	5	6	5	8	19	27	37	42	18	26
Late Morning (10-12 a.m.)	52	64	14	20	38	54	15	17	19	28
Lunch Time (12-1 p.m.)	7	9	12	17	14	20	2	2	13	19
Early Afternoon (1-3 p.m.)	0	0	17	25	10	14	5	6	19	27
Late Afternoon (3-5 p.m.)	2	3	1	2	1	1	5	6	6	8
Dinner Time (5-6 p.m.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	2
Early Evening (6-8 p.m.)	21	26	3	5	2	3	14	16	0	0
Late Evening (8-10 p.m.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Varies	11	14	26	38	13	19	18	20	23	33
Other Answer	2	2	21	31	1	2	0	0	1	2
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0

Comparatively few respondents cited late afternoon and evening. Three percent said late afternoon was their usual visitation time, one percent said dinner time, while eight percent mentioned every evening.

The variation among respondents in different cities with regard to usual time of visit was statistically much greater than could occur by chance (chi square = 0.0000). The possibly intervening variables of attending a recreation center in the park and income were controlled through separate analyses of variance. In both cases the relationship beteen city and usual time of visit remained statistically significant. The largest percentage of San Franciscians and Bostonians, 37.5% and 34.7% respectively, visited the park in the early afternoon; 37.2% of the Houstonians came in the early morning, 52.5% of the Atlantans and 39.1% of the Chicagoans in the late morning. Controlling for the possibly intervening variables of attending a recreation center in the park and income through analysis of variance did not alter the significance of this variation.

Statistical significance was also obtained when variation between the 55-65 and 66 and over was tested (chi square = .0049). However this significance was not maintained when the intervening variables of center visit and income were controlled through separate analyses of variance (F = .012 and .028). Therefore the relationship between age group and usual time of visit may be attributable to whether or not the respondent visited a center in the park.

Statistical significance was also obtained when variation between the age groups of 55-65 and over 65 was examined (chi square = .0000). However, the significance was lost when the above mentioned intervening variables were controlled through separate analyses of variance. F for attending recreation center in the park = .143 and F for income = .801. In other words the relation between age group and frequency of visit can largely be attributable to whether or not the respondent attended a recreation center in the park.

In terms of length of stay, older users stayed a surprising long time. About half the sample stayed from two to over five hours! An amazing 18 percent stayed four hours or more. Only 17 percent of all older visitors stayed an hour or less. Few respondents, only about one out of ten, said they had no usual length of stay. Variation in length of stay between those age 55-65 and those over 65 was often pronounced (See Table Eight). For instance, 38 percent of those over 65 stayed three or more hours while only 26 percent of those age 55-65 did so. Variation was found to be greater than could occur by chance (chi square = .0049). However whether the respondent was visiting a center while in the park appeared to intervene. An analysis of variance controlling for this variable yielded an F value of .183. Therefore length of stay is influenced by whether the person is attending a recreation center.

Length of stay also varied significantly by city (chi square = .0000) and neither of the intervening variables of attending a recreation center while in the park or income altered this. Forty-seven percent of the San Francisco park users stayed one to three hours. Forty-three percent of the Houstonians stayed three to five hours, while 58% of the Atlantans remained the same length of time. The duration of 49% of the Chicago park visits was between two and four hours. Bostonians, on the other hand, had shorter visits with just under one half of all respondents visiting two hours or less.

Older park users clearly prefer to use the park on weekdays (53%) as opposed to weekends (9%). The remaining users expressed no preference. Individual cities varied greatly in the extent to which weekdays were preferred, although there was no city in which users showed a greater

TABLE EIGHT. USUAL LENGTH OF PARK VISIT BY AGE GROUP

	55-65		66 and over	
	%	N	%	N
1/4 Hour or Less	2	6	0	1
1/4 Hour to 1/2 Hour	4	10	3	12
1/2 Hour to 3/4 Hour	9	23	5	20
3/4 Hour to 1 Hour	9	25	5	21
1 Hour to 1 1/2 Hour	11	29	10	41
1 1/2 Hour to 2 Hours	9	25	8	31
2 Hours to 3 Hours	16	43	18	72
3 Hours to 4 Hours	13	35	15	58
4 Hours to 5 Hours	10	26	20	78
More than 5 Hours	3	8	3	12
Varies	12	32	10	40
Other Answer	3	7	2	9
Don't Know	0	1	0	1

preference for weekends than weekdays. This variation in preference among cities was statistically greater than could have occurred by chance (chi square = 0.0000), however an analysis of variance conducted to control for the intervening variable of visiting a center while in the park negated the significance (F = .206). It would seem that preference for weekdays or weekend among cities is largely a function of when centers are open and available.

Park visitation was planned in advance by the majority of respondents (56%). About one-third of all visitors said they visited on the spur of the moment, nine percent said it varied and the remainder gave other answers. San Franciscians were most likely to visit on the spur of the moment (69%) while Atlantans were most likely to plan their visit in advance (94%). (See Table Nine) This variation among cities was found to be statistically significant (chi square = .0000). Neither of the intervening variables controlled separately through analysis of variance, visiting a center while in the park, or income, reduced this significance.

The majority of park users, 80%, lived within three miles of the site, with the largest group living under one mile. There was strong variation among the cities in this regard, (See Table Ten) which was found to be statistically greater than could have occurred by chance (chi square = .0000). Furthermore, neither of the intervening variables altered this. San Franciscians tended to live the closest while Atlantans lived the furthest away.

Transportation to and from the site was also examined. The finding was that nearly 1 in 2 park users walked to the site, followed by 1 in 3 who drove a personal vehicle. Variation among the cities was found to be significant in this case also (chi square = .0000) and also between age groups

TABLE NINE. AMOUNT OF PLANNING PRIOR TO VISIT BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Spur of Moment	1	1	46	68	22	31	18	22	69	102
Plan in Advance	94	118	38	57	56	80	75	91	24	35
Depends/Varies	5	6	6	9	21	30	4	5	6	9
Other Answer	0	0	10	15	1	2	2	3	1	1

TABLE TEN. DISTANCE RESPONDENT LIVES FROM PARK BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
3 Blocks or Less	5	6	21	32	29	42	15	18	39	59
4 Blocks to 1 Mile	18	23	20	31	29	43	34	41	33	50
1 Mile to 2 Miles	18	23	20	30	18	27	28	34	9	14
2 Miles to 3 Miles	15	19	11	16	13	19	10	12	5	8
3 Miles to 4 Miles	10	12	6	9	3	5	6	7	3	4
4 Miles or More	30	38	7	11	3	5	5	6	9	13
Other Answer	3	4	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3	1	2

(chi square = .0000). However in both cases the intervening variables of visiting a center while in the park and income reduced this significance when controlled for in separate analysis of variance (F sig. city/center = .388), (F sig. city/income = .351), (F sig. age/center = .394), (F sig. age/income = .300). Therefore mode of transportation may be a result of center/non-center use, where transportation may be provided, or requires a different type (i.e. driving to a distant center offering a specialized activity). Further, income would likely influence mode of transportation, considering the expense of owning a car or using public conveyance.

When older park users were asked if they had used the park in previous years, almost all (92 percent) said they had. Of these, two-thirds had used the park for eleven or more years and another 21 percent had used the park from six to ten years. Thus, older park users would appear to be in an excellent position to make evaluative judgements about the park.

taks6/3

Motivation-Satisfaction

Respondents were asked three questions concerning their motivation for visiting the park and what satisfactions, if any, were derived from visiting the park (Questions 24, 25, 26). When asked why they came to the park, a wide range of answers were given. Almost one in five (18%) answered by mentioning a specific leisure activity that they had come to participate in. These activities were diverse, and included dancing, hobbies, golf practice, dog walking, tennis, picnics, horseshoes, eating, reading, singing, exercise, going for walks, running, playing, sports, and swimming.

An additional 17 percent said they came in order to socialize or visit. Often such responses mentioned that they went to the park for "family occasions" or because their friends were there or that they took their grandchildren to the park. Enjoying nature was mentioned by 14 percent of the respondents. These answers often mentioned being outdoors, fresh air, birds, trees, or a beautiful view. Thirteen percent stated they came to the park as a change of pace. Getting out of the house, away from the office, or taking a break from routine were typical answers. About five percent said they came to spectate or watch an activity while 21 percent gave other reasons. These other reasons included responses such as "to keep busy," "to go where they weren't hurried," out of "habit," to pass the time or because there was nowhere else to go, curiosity, and because the park brought back memories were all mentioned.

Variation among respondents in different cities was great in regard to this question. (See Table Eleven) In San Francisco, for instance, only five percent of the respondents said the park visit served as a break or change while in Houston, 21 percent said so. In Atlanta, only two percent came for exercise but in Houston 16 percent did. This difference by city was

TABLE ELEVEN. ROLE PARK PLAYS IN RESPONDENTS LIFE BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Socialize, Visit	30	38	3	4	16	24	32	39	6	9
Relax	5	6	14	22	8	12	11	13	10	15
Enjoy Nature	2	2	26	39	10	15	0	0	22	33
Break or Change	15	19	9	14	13	19	21	25	4	6
Participate, Specific Activity	10	13	7	11	4	6	7	8	8	12
Exercise	2	3	6	9	11	16	16	19	11	17
Spectate	2	2	8	12	5	8	5	6	3	5
Conduct Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contemplate, Solitude	0	0	1	2	7	10	0	0	3	4
Other Answer	34	42	14	22	21	31	7	8	21	31
Don't Know	0	0	11	17	4	6	2	3	12	18

statistically much greater than could have occurred by chance. (chi-square = .0000) However, when the impact of an intervening variable, attended a recreation center in the park, was controlled through analysis of variance, the relationship was no longer significant at the .01 level. (F = .019) In other words, the relation between reason for visiting the park and individual city is largely attributable to whether or not the respondent attended a recreation center in the park. Difference in motivation for attending the park was also evident between younger users (55-65 years old) and older users (over 65 years old). Older users were more likely to come to socialize than younger ones, less likely to cite relaxation, and less likely to come for exercise, although eight percent did. This variation between age groups was greater than could have occurred by chance (chi-square = .0062).

However, when the impact of an intervening variable, attended a recreation center in the park, was controlled for through analysis of variance, the relationship was no longer significant at the .01 level. (F significance = .038) In other words, the relation between reason for visiting the park and age group is largely a result of whether or not the respondent attended a recreation center in the park.

Feelings After Visiting Park

Respondents were asked if they felt differently about things after visiting the park. Of those who responded "yes" or "no," about half (47%) said they did feel different. While some variation in response by city and by age was evidenced, this difference was not statistically significant.

Those who said they felt different about things after visiting the park were then asked to describe their feelings after a visit. Those who could describe their feelings overwhelmingly gave descriptions which were positive and in the mental, emotional, or spiritual realm. Such statements were exemplified by the following: "a better outlook," "soothed," "like I've done some good for myself and others," "like living when I get home," "healthier," "beautiful," "better about mankind." Forty-four percent gave such responses among those who said they felt different. Another five percent gave a positive response in the physical domain. Typical of such responses were "felt good after exercise," and "now I can take a nap." Another four percent gave "neutral" responses in the physical domain, although it could be argued that they are, in some ways, positive. Illustrative of such answers are "tired after dancing," "slowed down," and "rested." Less than one percent gave answers which could be considered negative.

Many respondents who said they felt different about things after visiting the park said they didn't know or couldn't describe how it was they felt differently.

While there was little difference in answers associated with age (chi-square = .4208) there was significant variation among cities and this variation continued to be statistically significant even when center usage was controlled for. (See Table Twelve) In Houston, for instance, 100 percent of those who said they felt different after visiting the park gave positive responses in the emotional or mental realm while in Chicago only 76 percent did. In Chicago, conversely, 24 percent gave a positive response in the physical domain while only three percent did in Boston and no one did in Houston. However, controlling for the intervening variable of income through the use of analysis of variance, produced results which were no longer significant at the .01 level (f significance = .023). Therefore the significant relationship between city and description of feelings can be attributed to level of income.

TABLE TWELVE. DESCRIPTION OF FEELINGS AFTER PARK VISIT BY CITY

	Atlanta		Boston		Chicago		Houston		San Francisco	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Positive (Emotional, Mental)	30	38	88	66	29	42	50	60	42	62
Positive (Physical)	6	7	3	2	9	13	0	0	7	11
Neutral (Emotional, Mental)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Neutral (Physical)	1	1	5	4	8	11	1	1	5	7
Negative (Emotional, Mental)	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative (Physical)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Other Answer	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1
Don't Know	63	79	1	1	53	78	48	58	45	67

Summary

A broad range of motivations drew older citizens to urban parks including participating in numerous activities, socializing with friends and family, escape from their previous environment and attraction to the natural environment. Motivation varied by age and by city but variation by city disappeared when recreation center usage was controlled for.

About half the sample said they felt different about things after visiting the park. Variation by age and city was not significant. Among those who could describe in what way they felt different, the vast majority of responses described positive mental or emotional change.

DGs6/4
12/3/81

A Factor Analysis of Older Park Users

In an exploratory investigation such as this, an over-riding concern, as stated in the proposal, was to determine whether or not it was possible to generalize about local park use among the elderly. One means of making such a determination was through the use of factor analysis. "Basically, factor analysis is a technique which can be used to take a large number of operational indices and reduce these to a smaller number of conceptual variables" (Blalock, 1950).

In order to determine what conceptual variables existed among the data, a "Q-type" factor analysis was undertaken, utilizing data from several questions in the interview schedule (questions 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26 and 27). Q-type factor analysis involves developing "clusters" of persons. Each developed cluster or factor is a hypothetical "person." This hypothetical person is defined in terms of "his" complete set of responses to the variables involved.

Statistical Treatment

Analysis of Data. The data were analyzed to determine the differences in park users' behavior patterns among older people. Since the goal of this exercise was the identification of subgroups of older park users, a Q-type factor analysis was used. There are two basic types of factor analysis--an "R" technique and a "Q" technique. The "R" technique deals with correlations among variables; the "Q" technique deals with correlations among people.

Item Development

In order to determine what dimensions of park usage patterns older people had, fifteen items were examined. Items were designed to focus upon the respondent's assessment of the park, logistics of use and motivation-satisfaction as well as identify those who used senior citizen centers in the park. Items were coded as dichotomous variables. A one (1) indicated a positive and a zero (0) indicated a negative status in regard to the variable in question.

For example, the first item was developed from the third question in the original questionnaire. The original question stated "Of the people who use this park, would you say you personally know most of them, some of them, a few of them, or none of them?" The set of answers then consisted of five categories. These are: (1) none of them, (2) a few of them, (3) some of them, (4) most of them, and (5) any other answer. In this case, the first category and the second category were combined to indicate a negative status in regard to knowing other users, while the third category and the fourth category were combined to indicate a positive status. The fifth category, "any other answer," was treated as a missing case. Similarly, the other fourteen items were developed from the original questionnaire. Thus, fifteen items providing dichotomous information were developed. These items are as follows:

1. I personally know the people who use this park.
2. I feel comfortable with the other park users.
3. I think this park is well-maintained.
4. I think this park is safe.
5. I come to this park nearly every day.
6. I have used this park in the past year.

7. I usually come to this park in the morning.
8. I usually stay here more than three hours.
9. I usually plan my visit to this park in advance.
10. I live more than one mile from the park.
11. I usually come to the park by myself.
12. I feel differently about things after I visit the park.
13. I feel better after I visit the park.
14. I visit the senior center when I come to the park.
15. I feel there is something I can not do in this park.

Factor Analysis

The number of people included in this analysis was 49. Because of the requirements of many more variables than people for "Q" analyses, it was impossible to analyze data from the entire sample of respondents. Using the SPSS random sampling program, 49 cases were drawn from the original pool of respondents for the first analysis.

A principle components inverse factor analysis utilizing a varimax rotation was calculated in order to identify groups of park users who have similar behavior patterns. Factor analysis was accomplished through the use of QUANAL, a library program at the Computer Center of The Pennsylvania State University.

The following options selected for use in this study from the QUANAL program assisted in the identification of park users' types:

a. An eigenvalue limit of 3.5 was established to control the factor process. When a factor contributed less than ten percent of the total variance, the contributive percentage was too small to be significant. The 3.5 value is higher than the level often used, but a lower eigenvalue was experimented with and the number of meaning factors identified in terms of percent of contributions to the variance was considerably below the recommended level.

b. Percentages regarding total and common variance for all types were calculated.

c. As a result of a varimax rotation, communalities or factor loadings indicated which subject was identified with a specific park user type.

d. Correlations between all pairs of factors were computed.

e. Typical user profiles by means of ranked arrays of the items, from most positively significant to most negatively significant, were listed to assist identification of each type.

f. Consensus items were identified.

Findings

Three factors with eigenvalues greater than 3.50 were extracted from the sample. The total percentage of variance accounted for by these three factors was 61.39. The common percentage of variance and the total percentage of variance after rotation are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Percentage of Total and Common Variance Contributed by each Factor After Varimax Rotation

Variance	1	2	3
Total Variance	39.9	12.4	9.1
Common Variance	64.9	20.22	14.8

The portion of the variance of each variable which is correlated with the other variables is described as communality. Communalities (factor loadings) for each person were calculated by taking the Pearson product moment correlation matrix (PPMCR) for the 49 variables (people). These communalities gave a clear estimate of the accuracy in defining each factor. The communalities in this study ranged mostly from .35 to .76. The simple structure matrix which shows factor loadings is listed in Appendix G. The highest loadings are underlined to indicate the factor identification of each particular subject.

As an example of the factor loadings in the simple matrix, the data for the first coded subject read:

Factor	1	2	3
Matrix	-0.105	0.269	0.073

This was interpreted to mean that this individual was highly representative of factor one. As a result of the varimax rotation phase, factors were resorted, various negative and positive items extracted, and new factors formed. In light of these calculations, three factors were established at this step in the analysis and the total number of subjects identified with each type was tabulated.

Significant relationships were found among the three factors. Correlations as computed between all possible pairs of the three factors are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Relationships Between Factors

Factor	1	2	3
1	X		
2	.362	X	
3	.604	.415	X

[a] Significant at the .05 level

The correlations between types were particularly high in this study. This meant that the factors were similar to one another. That is, either because of similarity of individuals' behavior patterns among older park users or the need for a more complete set of the behavior items, these factors were strongly related to each other. Three factors were identified through principle components factor analysis and varimax rotation. The highest factor within the simple structure matrix identified each subject by his user type. All types were named by the investigator in light of key words in the positive identifying statements for each type. The number of subjects who sorted themselves in the various types is presented in Table 15. According to the table, 17 respondents loaded highest on the factor 1, 19 loaded highest on the factor 2, 13 loaded highest on the factor 3.

Table 15. Distribution of Subjects by Park Users Type

Factor	Number
1	17
2	19
3	13

Identification of Park Users Type

Each park users type was identified on the basis of the "items greater than all others" and "items less than all others" for that particular type. These were simply the statements that were placed higher on the average by the numbers of a cluster than by the members of any other cluster. The three park users types among older people were identified. The members of the first type usually plan their visit to the park in advance and stay there more than three hours. Also, they live more than one mile from the park. These respondents also tended to have more income and better education than other respondents (Table 18). Respondents (type 2) who loaded strongly on the second factor come to the park by themselves everyday. These respondents tended to be younger and have less education than type 1 respondents. Type 3 respondents felt better after they visited the park. They thought the park was well-maintained. These respondents have less income than other respondents.

An items description array was established for each park user type with items placed in descending order on the basis of z-scores. In Table 16, the park user types are identified according to which items have their highest positive z-scores in each type (listed as "greater than all others") and their highest negative z-scores in each type (listed as "less than all others"). The statements in each table are listed in descending order according to the difference between the z-score in question and the average of all other z-scores for the particular statement.

Consensus items were the statements which did not vary more than one standard deviation throughout the analysis. Therefore, they were valued similarly by all the respondents and could not be considered to be meanings which discriminate strongly between clusters of participants. The nine consensus items, along with average z-scores, appear in Table 17. The higher positive z-scores indicated items which implied a positive response to the variable in question whereas the lower negative z-scores indicated a negative response.

Forty-six percent of the items were found to be consensus items. This is an extremely high percentage and indicates that only 54 percent of the items were actually discriminating among behavioral aspects of park users. Since the consensus items were statements of similar values to the 49 subjects, they gave insight into what tend to be shared behavior aspects of park users.

Summary

Perhaps the most important finding here is that there was an extremely high percentage of concensus items found in this analysis (46 percent). A concensus item is one which didn't vary more than one standard deviation throughout the analysis. This means many items were valued similarly by all respondents and can't be considered as items which discriminate strongly among clusters of participants. Thus, a high degree of commonality is exhibited among older users of local parks in response to the selected items. Since great variation in response was previously found when users were stratified by city and by individual park, it would seem logical that such variation reflects differences in prevailing conditions and situations at different park sites and within different cities rather than inherently different attitudes or behaviors of older people in these areas.

Not only was there a high percentage of concensus items, but correlations between each of the three identified factors were quite high (see Table 14). The correlation coefficient between factor one and factor three, for instance, was .604, indicating low differentiation between these two factors.

Table 16 shows the items with the highest loadings in each of the three factors while Appendix H shows a descending array of z-scores and item descriptions for each factor. As may be seen, each of the three factors contains only a small number of items--three or less. Furthermore, these items do not produce an intellectually satisfying subset of new explanatory variables. In other words, distinct subsets of older park users do not emerge from a Q-type factor. Thus, it must be concluded that older users of urban parks respond to these variables in ways which do not show a high degree of systematic differentiation.

Table 16. Greater Than and Less Than Item Descriptions

Park Users Type	Z-score
Type 1	
Items greater than all others	
I usually plan my visit to this park in advance	-1.135
I live more than one mile from the park	0.784
I usually stay here more than three hours	0.561
I usually come to this park in the morning	0.259
I personally know the people who use this park	-1.052
I visit the senior center when I come to the park	-1.205
I think this park is safe	1.179

Items less than all others

I feel better after I visit the park	-1.205
I feel differently about things after I visit the park	-1.205

Type 2

Items greater than all others

I usually come to the park by myself	1.292
I come to this park nearly everyday	0.369
I have used this park in the past year	1.602
I feel comfortable with the other park users	1.428
I feel there is something I can not do in this park	-1.080

Items less than all others

I think this park is well-maintained	0.640
I usually stay here more than three hours	-0.753
I live more than one mile from the park	-0.914
I usually plan my visit to this park in advance	-1.117

Type 3

Items greater than all others

I feel differently about things after I visit the park	1.044
I feel better after I visit the park	0.905
I think this park is well-maintained	0.974

Items less than all others

I think this park is safe	1.044
I personally know the people who use this park	-1.273
I feel there is something I can not do in the park	-1.280
I visit the senior center when I come to the park	-1.406
I feel comfortable with the other park users	1.044
I have used this park in the past year	0.698
I usually come to this park in the morning	-0.759
I come to this park nearly everyday	-1.169
I usually come to the park by myself	-1.208

Table 17. Consensus Items and Average Z-scores

Item Description	Z-scores
I feel comfortable with the other park users	1.22
I have used this park in the past year	1.16
I think this park is safe	1.09
I think this park is well-maintained	0.84
I feel there is something I can not do in this park	-1.18
I personally know the people who use this park	-1.18
I visit the senior center when I come to the park	-1.30

Table 18. Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Users Type

Park Users Type	Type 1 (N=17)	Type 2 (N=19)	Type 3 (N=13)
Sex			
Male	41	47	31
Female	59	53	69
Present Employment Status			
Employed full-time	12	05	31
Employed part-time	00	16	00
Retired and not working	65	63	38
Retired and working part-time	06	11	15
Unemployed but not retired	00	00	00
Full-time homemaker	18	05	15
Don't know/won't answer	00	00	00
Age			
55-65	29	53	54
66-75	65	31	31
76-85	06	16	15
85-over	00	00	00
Income			
Less than $4,999	18	11	31
$5,000 to $9,999	18	11	46
$10,000 to $16,999	12	31	23
$17,000 to $29,999	18	11	00
$30,000 and over	06	00	00
N/A	29	36	00
Education			
Elementary School	06	11	00
Junior High School	24	16	31
High School	29	36	23
College	41	21	38
Graduate School	00	11	08
N/A	00	05	00

LMs13/95

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

A number of conclusions from the findings of the study would appear to have implication for the management of urban recreation and park systems with reference to older people. Among such conclusions and implications are the following:

1. Neighborhood urban parks serve a diverse spectrum of older Americans. While some urban recreation and park services, such as senior citizen centers, tend to serve a more specialized older clientele (disproportionately women, low education level, low income, etc.), local parks serve a broad cross-section of older residents. In terms of education level, income level, gender, ethnic status, age and other demographics, older park visitors exhibited great variety. Thus, the neighborhood park experience transcends social and economic class.

2. The vast majority of older park users are ordinary people doing ordinary types of things. This finding is identical to another study of users of central city parks (More: 1980). While there may be a tendency to think that much park behavior is deviant or that older park users are "kooks," this study found little evidence to support such a contention. Walking, talking, looking, sitting, exercising were the commonplace activities. With only a few exceptions, very little bizarre behavior was evidenced.

3. Local park use by those 55-65 is remarkably similar to those over 65. While the older group is slightly less involved in physically demanding behaviors and varies from the younger group with regard to some logistics of use, the younger and older groups do not vary in terms of their assessment of the park nor do they vary in terms of motivation and satisfactions derived from the park experience. (One exception to this was that people over 65 years old stressed that they used the park to socialize more than those 55-65, but less to "relax" or to exercise.) Thus, it would appear that judgements about the safety or quality of maintenance of a park are fairly consistent for all those age 55 and over. Similarly, the satisfactions derived from park use don't vary by age among those 55 and older. One planning implication from these findings is that planning local parks with reference to maintenance and safety does not have to single out "senior citizens" but may plan more inclusively for older people. Another important implication would appear to be that, since motivation/satisfaction were not significantly different between those in the 55-65 group and the over 65 age group, nor was the assessment of parks, satisfaction with park use does not decline with age among older park users.

4. Older people, generally speaking, exhibit a common set of motivations and satisfactions from neighborhood park use and exhibit a common set of behaviors (although, obviously, those who use senior citizen centers in parks vary from those who do not). While older people are similar in motivation and behavior, their assessment of parks and logistics of use does vary greatly. This would seem to indicate that while older people

in different cities are similar in terms of the role neighborhood parks play in their lives, they face different conditions and constraints in different parks and in different cities. Because of this, while park planners can use data from other cities concerning the park usage patterns of older people, site specific planning must evolve from a knowledge of existing situations at a particular site.

5. The usage patterns of older park users are highly manipulatable. Older users tend to base their visitation patterns and behaviors upon conditions which exist in the park rather than upon personal considerations. In regard to scheduling park visits, for instance, older users will make the decision of when to visit around issues such as: when is the park safe, when is the park likely to sponsor special events of interest to me, when will be park environment be most desirable, rather than considerations such as: when does going to the park best fit into my daily schedule. Park managers, therefore, may be able to shape the usage patterns of older people or encourage more use by how they maintain, program or provide for safety in the park. Since the vast majority of park use for older people takes place during the morning or early afternoon, this is when special efforts might be made to make the park more attractive to the older user.

6. The park usage patterns of older people are as likely to represent a part of routine as a break from routine. Older users visit on a very frequent basis, come at a usual time, stay for a usual amount of time, prefer weekends or weekdays, plan their visit in advance and use the same park for many years. Also, they pursue a specific recreation activity while on site.

A number of things are implied from this. Kaplan has called park use a "roleless" situation. To the extent that park use is "routine," however, it makes little sense for it to be "roleless." The vast expanses of grass, dirt, trees, litter, trashcans and benches, which constitute many local parks in urban areas, don't seem to provide the basis for a routine. While many younger users may use the park as a break for work or as counterpoint to routine, this changes for older users. What would seem to be implied here is that urban parks must be designed and operated in ways which recognize the systematically different role that urban parks play in the lives of older people. Since those users age 55 and over visit quite frequently, are likely to pursue a specific activity as well as to socialize, and are likely to stay in the park for relatively long periods of time, greater emphasis should be given to the organized provision of recreation and leisure programs geared to older people. Summer playground programs do this for children and adolescents. Athletic leagues, rock concerts, marathons and other events are held primarily for younger adults. Comparable program opportunities need to exist for older park users which recognize the difference in the role the park plays for them. Very few organized opportunities exist in parks although, in a few instances, gardening plots have been provided. While a few parks have recreation or senior citizen centers on site, most do not. Even where such centers exist, however, the issue of making parks more of a pleasure for older adults must be addressed, since park use is an outdoor experience.

From the previous, it may also be implied that a larger portion of areas and facilities of local parks should be specifically designed for older adults. Throughout the course of this study, few examples of park facilities designed for older adults were in evidence. With many kinds of park equipment and facilities, the design features were not specialized for any age group or were specialized for a younger age group. While swings were found in many parks, for instance, there was only one park in which swings had been designed in a way to be of use to older adults. While a golf putting green was found in one park, baseball and softball fields and basketball courts were found in nearly every park. Where there were swimming pools, they often seemed more designed for competitive swimming and diving than for the water usage patterns of older adults.

7. Park visitation appears to be an important event in creating a positive state of mind among older people.

About half the sample said they felt different about things after visiting the park and the typical descriptions of such feelings were intensely positive and of an emotional, spiritual, or psychological nature. Negative change was almost non-existent. Perhaps, then, local parks should be thought of as an important resource contributing to the emotional health of older citizens. The quality of safety, maintenance and program features of such parks may be importantly related to the contribution this resource makes.

REFERENCES

Axelrod, M. and Cannell, C. F. "A Research Note on an Attempt to Predict Interviewer Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1959, Vol. 23, pp. 571-576.

Babchuk, N. and A. Booth. "Voluntary Association Membership--A Longitudinal Analysis," American Sociological Review, 1969, Vol. 34, pp. 31-45.

Baley, J. A. "Recreation and Aging Process," Research Quarterly, 1955, Vol. 26, pp. 1-7.

Barton, A. and Lazarfeld, P., "Some Functions of Qualitative Analysis in Social Research," Frankfurter Beitrage zur Sociologie (1955) Vol. 1, p. 321, p. 361.

Bennett, Archibald. "Twelve Ways to Improve Field Research," Advertising and Selling, December, 1947, Vol. 48, pp. 90-93.

Bishop, Doyle. "Stability of the Factor Structure of Leisure Behavior: Analyses of Four Communities," Journal of Leisure Research, 1970, Vol. 2(3), pp. 160-170.

Bultena, G. and V. Wood. "Leisure Orientation and Recreational Activities of Retirement Community Residents," Journal of Leisure Research, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 3-15.

________, CRL Exchange Bibliography #254, Contemporary Research on the Effects of the Physical Setting on the Aging Individual.

Chalfen, L. "Leisure Time Adjustment of the Aged: Activities and Interests and Some Factors Influencing Choice," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 88, pp. 261-276.

Christiansen, J. E. and R. Yvesting. "Social and Attitudinal Variants in High and Low Use of Outdoor Recreational Facilities," Journal of Leisure Research, 1973, Vol. 5, pp. 25-36.

Cumming E. and W. E. Henry. Growing Old: The Process of Disengagement. Basic Books, 1961.

Cunningham, D., et al. "Active Leisure Activities as Related to Occupation," Journal of Leisure Research, 1970, Vol. 2, pp. 104-111.

Deroches, H. F. and B. D. Raiman. "Stability of Activity Participation in an Aged Population," Journal of Gerontology, 1964, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 211-214.

Gans, Herbert. "City Planning and Urban Realities," American Institute of Planning Journal, January, 1962, p. 132.

Godbey, Geoffrey, Arthur Patterson and Laura Brown, "The Relationship of Crime and Fear of Crime Among the Aged to Leisure Behavior and Use of Public Leisure Services," Washington, D.C.: NRTA/AARP Andrus Foundation, 1979.

Godbey, Geoffrey and John Robinson. "Outdoor Recreation and Age: A Study of Supply and Demand," unpublished, Penn State University, 1980.

Gold, Seymour. "Non-Use of Neighborhood Parks," *American Institute of Planning Journal*, November, 1972, pp. 369-377.

Gordon, Chad, C. M. Gaitz and J. Scott. "Value Priorities and Leisure Activities Among Middle-aged and Older Anglos." *Diseases of the Nervous System*, 1973, Vol. 34, pp. 13-26.

Graney, M. "Media Use as a Substitute Activity in Old Age," *Journal of Gerontology*, 1974, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 322-324.

Havighurst, R. "The Leisure Activities of the Middle Aged," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1957, Vol. 68, pp. 152-162.

Havighurst, R. Chicago Study, *Gerontologist*, Vol. 16, No. 1, Part II, 1976, pp. 70-75.

Hoar, J. "A Study of Free-Time Activities of 200 Aged Persons," *Sociology and Social Research*, 1961, Vol. 2, pp. 157-163.

Jawesova, H. "The Leisure Time of City Residents in the Light of Urban Living Conditions and Environment," *Society and Leisure*, 1971, Vol. 1, pp. 121-144.

Kaplan, M. *Leisure: Lifestyle and Lifespan*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1979.

Kelly, John. "Leisure and Quality: Beyond the Quantitative Barrier in Research," in *Recreation and Leisure: Issues In An Era of Change*, edited by Thomas Goodale and Peter Witt, State College, Pa.: Venture Publishing, 1980.

Kelly, John. "Outdoor Recreation Participation: A Comparative Analysis," *Leisure Sciences*, 1980, Vol. 3, pp. 129-155.

Kutner, B., et al. *Five Hundred Over Sixty*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956.

Malt, H., and Associates. *An Analysis of Public Safety as Related to the Incidence of Crime in Parks and Recreation Areas in Central Cities*. Washington, D.C.: HUD, January, 1972.

Morgan, A. and G. Godbey. "Changes in Leisure Behavior as the Result of Moving to an Age-Segregated Environment," *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1978, Vol. 1.

Neugarten, Bernice. "Time, Age and the Life Cycle," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 136, July, 1979.

Noland, M. and A. J. Sofranko. "Influence of Social, Economic and Work-Related Factors of Levels of Sports Participation," *Society and Leisure*, 1973, Vol. 3, pp. 111-122.

Oderwald, R. G., J. D. Wellman and G. L. Buhyoff. "Multi-Stage Sampling of Recreationists: A Methodological Note on Unequal Probability Sampling," *Leisure Sciences*, 1980, Vol. 3, pp. 213-218.

Palmore, E. G. "The Effects of Aging on Activities and Attitudes," *The Gerontologist*, 1968, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 259-263.

Rebok, George and William Hoyer. "The Functional Context of Elderly Behavior," *Gerontologist*, 1977, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 27-33.

Sessoms, Douglas. "An Analysis of Selected Variables Affecting Outdoor Recreation Patterns," *Social Forces*, Vol. 42, October, 1963, pp. 311-320.

Stember, Herbert and Herbert Hyman. "Interviewer Effects in Classification of Responses," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 13, p. 669-684.

U.S. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Participation In Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults: ORRRC Study Report 20. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The 1970 Survey of Outdoor Recreation Activities: Preliminary Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Department of Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. Report on the 1977 National Outdoor Recreation Surveys--Formal Review Draft, unpublished.

U.S. Department of Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. The Third Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan--The Executive Report. Washington, D.C.: HCRS, 1979.

U.S. Department of Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. National Urban Recreation Study. Washington, D.C.: HCRS, 1978.

White, Terrance. "The Relative Importance of Education and Income As Predictors in Outdoor Recreation Participation, *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 7, 1975, pp. 191-199.

Whyte, William. "Urban Recreation Use," Annual Report to the President and Council on Environmental Quality. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Zborowski, M. "Aging and Recreation," *Journal of Gerontology*, 1962, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 302-309.

Zelan, Joseph. "Interviewing the Aged," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Fall, 1969, pp. 421-424.

dml/1

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
BY NUMBER (N) AND PERCENTAGE (%)

N	%	Q1	Would you say this park is for people of all ages?
666	96		1. yes
21	3		2. no
5	1		3. other answer ______________________
3	0		4. don't know

N	%	Q2	If no, for whom is the park intended?
16	94		1. younger people
1	6		2. college students

N	%	Q3	Of the people who use this park, would you say you personally know most of them, some of them, a few of them, or none of them?
152	22		1. none of them
263	38		2. a few of them
187	27		3. some of them
86	12		4. most of them
4	1		5. any other answer

N	%	Q4	Do you feel comfortable with the other people who use this park?
595	86		1. yes
18	3		2. no
62	9		3. some of them/sometimes
10	1		4 other answer ______________________
9	1		5. don't know

N	%	Q5	Why do you say that?
378	54		1. likes or trusts other users
44	6		2. dislikes or distrusts other users
171	25		3. no evidence of trouble
7	1		4. evidence of trouble
20	3		5. good neighborhood
1	0		6. bad neighborhood
4	1		7. police or friends protect me
40	6		8. other answer
12	2		9. don't know
18	3		10. missing

N	%	Q6	Overall, is this park well-maintained and taken care of?
523	76		1. yes
92	13		2. no
56	8		3. other answer _________________
17	2		4. don't know

N	%	Q7	Why do you think that?
421	61		1. positive physical evidence
49	7		2. negative physical evidence
74	11		3. observed maintenanc workers
10	1		4. didn't observe maintenance workers
9	1		5. responsible users
22	3		6. unresponsible users
1	0		7. good neighborhood
94	14		8. other answer ____________________
5	1		9. don't know
10	1		10. no answer

N	%	Q8	What do people in your age range like to do when they come here?
274	39		1. sport/exercise
146	21		2. non-physical games/hobbies
6	1		3. attend organized rec program
7	1		4. music--listen or play
68	10		5. sitting, watching
76	11		6. socialize--family, friends
86	12		7. other answer __________________
28	4		8. don't know
4	1		9. no answer

N	%	Q9	Do you think this park is safe?
449	65		1. yes
43	6		2. no
143	21		3. sometimes
33	5		4. other answer _________________
21	3		5. don't know

N	%	Q10	Why do you think that?
17	2		1. likes users
26	4		2. dislikes users
344	49		3. no evidence of trouble
26	4		4. evidence of trouble
34	5		5. police or friends protect me
2	0		6. police or friends don't protect me
18	3		7. good neighborhood
2	0		8. bad neighborhood
192	28		9. other answer _________________
30	4		10. don't know
4	1		11. no answer

N	%	Q11	How often do you come to this park?
18	3		1. twice a day or more
70	10		2. every day
133	19		3. nearly every day
169	25		4. a few times a week
120	17		5. once a week
69	10		6. a few times a month
19	3		7. a few times a year
11	2		8. don't know
77	11		9. other

Q12 Have you used this park in past years?

N	%	
619	92	1. yes
55	8	2. no

Q13 If "yes," how many years? (record actual number)

N	%	Years
75	11	0
42	6	1
187	28	2-5
142	21	6-10
249	66	11 or more

Q14 What time of day do you usually come here?

N	%	
109	16	1. early morning (7-10 a.m.)
183	27	2. late morning (10-12 a.m.)
67	10	3. lunch time (12-1 p.m.)
72	11	4. early afternoon (1-3 p.m.)
20	3	5. late afternoon (3-5 p.m.)
6	1	6. dinner time (5-6 p.m.)
50	7	7. early evening (6-8 p.m.)
0	0	8. late evening (8-10 p.m.)
124	19	9. no usual time--varies
37	6	10. other answer ________________________
2	0	11. don't know

Q15 How long do you usually stay?

N	%	
7	1	1. 1/4 hour or less
22	3	2. more than 1/4 hour to 1/2 hour
43	6	3. more than 1/2 to 3/4 hour
46	7	4. more than 3/4 hour to 1 hour
72	11	5. more than 1 hour to 1-1/2 hours
56	8	6. more than 1-1/2 hours to 2 hours
119	17	7. more than 2 hours to 3 hours
96	14	8. more than 3 hours to 4 hours
105	15	9. more than 4 hours to 5 hours
20	3	10. more than 5 hours
77	11	11. no usual length of stay--varies
19	3	12. any other answer
3	0	13. don't know

Q16 Why do you usually come to the park at ________ a.m. p.m. ?
(Write time you usually come to park)

N	%	
43	6	1. work related
204	29	2. park program, facility or feature related
24	3	3. being with other people
32	5	4. weather related
43	6	5. condition of park better
34	5	6. related to other obligations
28	4	7. transportation related
136	20	8. other answer ____________________
151	22	9. don't know

N	%	Q17	Do you prefer coming to the park on weekends or weekdays?
362	53		1. weekdays
58	8		2. weekends
258	38		3. no preference
8	1		4. other answer ____________________

N	%	Q18	Why do you prefer coming to the park on __________________? (Write in day of week)
97	23		1. condition of park better
35	8		2. being with other people
147	35		3. park program facility
113	27		4. work-related
4	1		5. transportation
19	5		6. only time in area
0	0		7. don't know/no answer

N	%	Q19	When you come to the park, do you usually plan your visit in advance or decide to come on the spur of the moment?
224	33		1. spur of the moment
381	56		2. plan in advance
59	9		3. it depends--varies at times
21	3		4. other answer______________________________________

N	%	Q20	(If "planned in advance"): How far ahead do you usually plan your park visit?
43	11		1. a few hours
65	16		2. a day
89	22		3. a few days
118	29		4. week or more
27	7		5. it depends/varies
58	14		6. other answer__________________

N	%	Q21	How far do you live from the park?
157	23		1. 3 blocks or less
188	27		2. 4 blocks to one mile
128	18		3. one mile to 2 miles
74	11		4. 2 miles to 3 miles
37	5		5. 3 miles to 4 miles
73	11		6. 4 miles or more
27	4		7. other answer______________________
6	1		8. don't know

N	%	Q22	How do you usually travel to this park (check all that apply)
322	47		1. walk
10	1		2. bicycle
211	31		3. drive my own car
56	8		4. car pool or ride with others
0	0		5. taxi
59	9		6. bus, subway or trolley
29	4		7. other (specify)____________________

N	%	Q23	Do you usually come to the park? (Ask type and number if relevant)	How Many Come With You?
314	56		1. by yourself	______
106	19		2. with a friend	______
24	4		3. with a neighbor	______
53	9		4. with your spouse	______
4	1		5. with your child	______
23	4		6. with your grandchild	______
12	2		7. it depends/varies	______
26	5		8. other answer ________________	

N	%	Q24	Have you ever thought about why you come to the park? What role does it play in your life?
114	16		1. socialize, visit
68	10		2. relax
89	13		3. enjoy nature
83	12		4. break or change
50	7		5. participate in specific activity
64	9		6. exercise
33	5		7. spectate, watch program
0	0		8. business conducted
16	2		9. contemplate, solitude
134	19		10. other answer ______________________
44	6		11. don't know, no answer

What else can you tell me about that?

____

____

____

____

N	%	Q25	Do you feel differently about things after you visit the park?
320	47		1. yes
325	48		2. no
39	6		3. other answer ______________________

N	%	Q26	(If "yes,") can you describe how you feel after visiting the park?
268	44		1. positive emotional
33	5		2. positive physical
1	0		3. neutral emotional
24	4		4. neutral physical
1	0		5. negative emotional
1	0		6. negative physical
4	1		7. other answer ________________
283	46		8. don't know

Next, let's talk about some of the things you do while at the park--and also things you'd like to do.

N	%	Q27 What do you usually do when you come to the park?
136	20	1. socialize, visit
225	32	2. relax
86	12	3. enjoy nature
121	17	4. break or change
14	2	5. participate in specific activity or program
48	7	6. exercise
24	3	7. spectate, watch program
16	2	8. business conducted
2	0	9. contemplate solitude
13	2	10. other answer ______________
6	1	11. don't know
		Anything else?
36	7	12. socialize, visit
98	20	13. relax
111	23	14. enjoy nature
82	17	15. break or change
27	6	16. participate in specific activity or program
75	15	17. exercise
4	1	18. spectate, watch program
26	5	19. business conducted
3	1	20. contemplate solitude
2	0	21. other answer ______________
24	5	22. don't know

N	%	Q28 Is there anything you can't do in the park but would like to?
59	9	1. yes
612	89	2. no
3	0	3. other answer______________________
13	2	4. don't know

N	%	Q29 (If "yes,") what would you like to do?
19	28	1. activity oriented
5	7	2. maintenance oriented
15	22	3. facility oriented
5	7	4. personal health oriented
2	3	5. other park user oriented
4	6	6. safety oriented
17	25	7. other answer ________________
0	0	8. don't know/no answer

N	%	Q30 If you could change one thing about this park, what would you change?
11	2	1. activity oriented
91	13	2. maintenance oriented
134	19	3. facility oriented
28	4	4. personal health oriented
25	4	5. other park users
45	0	6. safety oriented
16	2	7. policy changes

N	%	Q32	Sex of respondent (Don't ask--just record)
328	48		1. male
360	52		2. female

N	%	Q33	Would you say your health was poor, below average, average, good, or excellent?
112	16		1. excellent
273	40		2. good
232	34		3. average
35	5		4. below average
19	3		5. poor
12	2		6. other answer________________
4	1		7. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q34	What is your present marital status? Are you married, never married, divorced, separated, widowed?
334	49		1. married
53	8		2. never married
48	7		3. divorced
12	2		4. separated
237	34		5. widowed
4	1		6. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q35	DIRECTIONS: Ask only if this is not obvious: Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic status?
185	27		1. Black (Negro)
462	67		2. White (Caucasian)
20	3		3. Mexican-American
			4. Puerto Rican
12	2		5. Oriental
1	0		6. American Indian (Native American)
6	1		7. other (please specify)______
1	0		8. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q36	Are you presently
73	11		1. employed full-time
33	5		2. employed part-time
414	60		3. retired and not working
57	8		4. retired and working part-time
26	4		5. unemployed but not retired
79	11		6. full-time homemaker
4	1		7. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q37	DIRECTIONS: Give age category card to the respondent and ask the following: To which of these age categories do you belong?
136	20		1. 56-60
137	20		2. 61-65
164	24		3. 66-70
151	22		4. 71-75
66	10		5. 76-80
18	3		6. 81-85
8	1		7. 86-90
2	0		8. 91-over
			9. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q38	DIRECTIONS: Give income category card to the respondent and ask the following: Which of these categories best describes the total income from your household before taxes in 1980?
3	0		1. less than $1,000
9	1		2. $1,000 to $1,999
21	3		3. $2,000 to $2,999
34	5		4. $3,000 to $3,999
26	4		5. $4,000 to $4,999
40	6		6. $5,000 to $5,999
50	8		7. $6,000 to $7,999
55	8		8. $8,000 to $9,999
49	7		9. $10,000 to $11,999
44	7		10. $12,000 to $13,999
40	6		11. $14,000 to $16,999
23	3		12. $17,000 to $19,999
31	5		13. $20,000 to $24,999
31	5		14. $25,000 to $29,000
18	3		15. $30,000 to $39,999
14	2		16. $40,000 to $49,000
13	2		17. $50,000 and over
165	25		18. don't know/won't answer

N	%	Q39	DIRECTIONS: Give education category card to the respondent and ask the following: What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed?
3	0		1. no formal education
30	4		2. some grade school
49	7		3. completed 6th grade
68	10		4. some junior high school
46	7		5. completed 9th grade
83	12		6. some high school
164	24		7. completed high school
109	16		8. some college
62	9		9. completed Bachelor's Degree
21	3		10. some graduate work
28	4		11. completed Master's or other post-graduate degree
10	1		12. other (please specify)____________________
9	1		13. don't know/won't answer

APPENDIX B - FIELD DIRECTOR'S TRAVEL REPORT

FIELD DIRECTOR'S TRAVEL REPORT

The field director began interviewer training in San Francisco on Tuesday, April 21, 1981. Interviewers Sandra Banducci and Sharon Coggeshall had been contacted by academic consultant Ginny Jaquith. The first meeting took place on the San Francisco State University Campus at 8:30 a.m. The preliminary meeting included the following:

1. Completion of The Pennsylvania State University employee records and forms such as payroll cards, W-4 forms, expense vouchers, patent agreements and hours worked record sheet.
2. Explanation of study, sponsor and interview instrument purposes.
3. Explanation sampling procedures (see attached sheet).
4. Explanation of interview procedures (see attached sheet).
5. Discussion of each question on the interview schedule with emphasis on key words and method of coding and recording answers.
6. Examination of the completed sample instrument.
7. Discussion of possible responses.
8. Methods and instructions in paraphrasing responses.
9. Discussion of what to do in the event of termination of the interview by the respondent.
10. Explanation of photography instructions.

Subsequent to the preliminary meeting, the interviewers conducted complete practice interviews on each other.

The afternoon of April 21 was spent visiting the park sites chosen for the study. The interviewers conducted practice interviews in three of the sites: Crocker-Amazon, Mission Delores, and Alta Plaza. The field director examined each of the completed practice interview schedules, approving one for inclusion in the data. All subsequent interviews were deemed acceptable.

The two remaining sites were visited to determine suitability for study purposes. Kimball/Hamilton was deemed unacceptable as the site was bisected by heavily-travelled Geary Boulevard, causing the site to be two smaller parks. The fifth site, Muscone, was found to be acceptable.

Wednesday, April 22, was spent interviewing in Alta Plaza and Muscone Parks. The field director conducted several interviews in addition to critiquing the interviewers. A late afternoon meeting with the academic consultant led to the discussion to include Washington Square as the fifth study site as a replacement for Kimball-Hamilton. In spite of its small size, this park is heavily used by the surrounding neighborhoods.

On Thursday, April 23, the field director and interviewer Sandy Banducci conducted interviews in Alta Plaza and Muscone Parks, until fog and rapidly falling temperatures caused them to leave (as per interviewer instructions). An evening meeting with the academic consultant was held during which each site was discussed with regard to any special considerations in sampling. Interviewers were discussed with regard to handwriting, completeness of recording responses, and compatability with the study. Instructions regarding deadlines, photocopying of instruments, and returning them to the study directors were discussed.

On Friday, April 24, the field director and interviewer Sandy Banducci again conducted interviews in Alta Plaza and Muscone Parks. The field director departed San Francisco that evening.

Interviewer training commenced on Monday morning, April 27, at the Rodeway Inn near the Houston Airport, this site being convenient for the academic consultant, Dr. Dan Kamp, from Texas A&M University. One interviewer, Rita Digneo, was hired for the Houston phase of the study. Items 1-10 of the preliminary meeting schedule used in San Francisco were discussed at that time. At 10:00 a.m. Jim O'Rourke and Betty Webb, of the Houston Park and Recreation Department, and Dr. Dan Kamp arrived to discuss potential study sites. Seven sites were presented with five being selected for visitation. Those sites were Clark Park, Independence Heights, Mason Park, Candlelight Park, and Denver Harbor Park. The Field Director, interviewer, and Houston Park and Recreation representatives then went to Mason Park and began visitations of sites to determine suitability.

While in Mason Park, the interviewer conducted a practice interview with the field director and then walked about the park in the manner prescribed in the interviewer instructions. Each of the other four sites was then visited by the field director and interviewer. Denver Harbor was found to be unsuitable and, due to the mid-afternoon heat, only one interview was obtained, that in well-shaded Candlelight Park.

Tuesday, April 28, was spent attempting to obtain interviews in Candlelight and Clark Parks during the cooler morning hours. Again, only one interview was obtained in Candlelight Park. Afternoon and evening heat and humidity again made further interviewing difficult.

On Wednesday, April 29, the field director and interviewer met again with Betty Webb, who escorted them to Independence Heights and Clark Parks to talk with activity directors regarding the best hours to make subject contacts. A decision was made to substitute Fleming Park for Denver Harbor.

Final contact with the academic consultant was delayed until the field director's return to State Colege, at which time he was given instructions similar to those given in San Francisco.

The field director departed for Atlanta on Thursday, April 30, arriving at 2:30 p.m. and immediately met with the academic consultant, Dr. Charles Exley, of Georgia State Univeristy. The consultant indicated that few of the preparations had been made. A 4:00 p.m. appointment was made with Pam Taylor, of the Atlanta Park and Recreation Department, to discuss potential study sites. Of special interest was the fact that Atlanta's population is 87% Black, resulting in heavy usage at all sites by Blacks. Seven sites were selected for visitation. The sites were Anderson, Knight, Lang Carson, Mozley, Perkerson, Pittman, and West Manor Parks. Visitation to the sites was arranged for 1:00 p.m. on Friday, May 1.

Friday, May 1, the academic consulant spent the morning attempting to hire an interviewer. At 1:00 p.m., the consultant and field director were accompanied by a representative of the Atlanta Park and Recreation Department, who escorted them to the seven prospective sites. Of the seven, Knight Park was excluded for failing to meet size requirements, and Anderson was assigned alternate status due to construction in the site.

At 4:00 p.m., the consultant secured the services of Dorothy Mohr as the interviewer. A 7:00 p.m. meeting was scheduled during which the interviewer was instructed in the 10 items discussed with the previous interviewers. No on-site practice interviews were possible as the Atlanta officials had asked that no visitations be made to the sites until the interviewer could be introduced to the park supervisors. This policy was made to prevent difficulties as a result of the Atlanta child murders.

On Saturday, May 2, the field director met with the Chicago academic consultant, Lisa Raymond, of Chicago State University. All instructions regarding interviewer training and consultant responsibilities were discussed at that time due to the consultant's need to be at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana throughout the week.

The interviewers and field director met at 1:00 p.m. on Monday, May 4, on the Campus of Chicago State University. The interviewers, Annebelle Thorpe and Caroline Murray, underwent the instructions common to all. After the instructions, each interviewer practiced interviewing the other. The field director and interviewer, Caroline Murray, then proceeded to Tuley and Avalon Parks to check suitability of the sites and attempt sample interviews. However, no seniors were present at either site.

Tuesday, May 5, the field director and interviewer, Annebelle Thorpe, visited Shabonna and Hiawatha Parks; however, temperatures were 20 degrees below the minimum recommended in the interview instructions and no respondents were present. The sites were approved, however, and contacts made with supervisors to acquaint them with the study and to get their recommendations on the best times to find potential respondents on the site. The field director also visited Welles Park and found it to be suitable for purposes of the study.

On Wednesday, May 6, the field director and interviewer, Caroline Murray, went to Avalon Park and conducted practice interviews with several of the members of a senior citizen bridge club which was meeting in the activity center. After one completed interview schedule was critiqued and rejected, the interviewer successfully completed all subsequent schedules.

The interviewer was to have met with interviewer Annebelle Thorpe to conduct practice interviews in Shabonna and Hiawatha Parks on Thursday, May 7. Unfortunately, the meeting was not accomplished as the interviewer had a conflict. The field director left instructions that the academic consultant, who was in daily telephone contact, obtain sample practice interviews and forward them to Penn State. This was done and the interviewer approved to continue.

The final city to be studied was Boston, in which interviewer training occurred on Friday, May 8, 1981. Academic consultant Dr. Jay McMillen of Northeastern University had tentatively hired two interviewers, Annette Cardenuto Moore and Julie Hebron. Their training began at 9:30 a.m. and included all of the items previously indicated. After discussing those topics, the interviewers and field director moved to one of the sites, the Back Bay Fens, discussed sampling methods and completed two successful interviews. The academic consultant, interviewers and field director then visited five other prospective sites, three of which were approved. They were: Chestnut Hill, Columbus and Gibson Parks. The fifth site, Herter Park, was eventually selected by the academic consultant. Late in the afternoon the academic consultant was given the final instructions regarding interviewer supervision and the return of the instruments to Penn State.

SAN FRANCISCO

Site 1: Crocker-Amazon Playground

This 54.95-acre developed park is located on the far south side of the city. Facilities include a baseball diamond with grandstand, softball and soccer fields, tennis and bocci courts, and playground equipment area. A new recreation building has been added recently, drawing many seniors to organized and drop-in programs. The population of the surrounding area is middle-class, mixed ethnically with Italians, Latins and Caucasians represented.

Site 2: Mission Delores

The Mission area of San Francisco is populated by a large number of Spanish-speaking persons; however, Whites are also likely to use the park. The area is mixed also in terms of economic status. The 13.37 acres of the park have been developed into large open spaces on hillsides sloping away from the higher south and west sides. Broad paved paths circle the southern 2/3, passing many benches with views of the city skyline. The more level lower north end includes athletic fields and tennis courts. A large children's play area is located toward the south end. During pilot testing, many persons were seen sitting in the sun or watching children on the equipment.

Site 3: Washington Square

Washington Square's four acres receive considerable passive use from a broad range of ethnic groups and economic classes. Located in the northeast area near Telegraph Hill, the park is near Italian, Chinese, and White areas. A children's playground has been developed in the northwest corner. The remainder of the park is turf and landscaped areas with numerous benches facing into the park or toward the surrounding streets. Most users were seen involved in passive pursuits, reading, sunning, visiting or watching children or others.

Site 4: Alta Plaza

This 11.89-acre park has been developed on the sides and top of a rather steep hill in the Pacific Heights area. On the south and east sides are a series of pathways and benches. Those on the east side have an unobstructed view of the city skyline. The south slope pathways and benches are bordered by high hedges (approximately 8'), providing privacy for both user and homeowners across the street. A children's playground, asphalt basketball court and tennis courts have been developed on terraces near the top. Open level turf areas were found on the hill top and extended to the north bordering street. The area is White middle- and upper-class.

Site 5: Muscone Recreation Center

This 12.05-acre park is fully developed with two baseball diamonds and grandstands, two softball fields, tennis courts, two children's play areas, a putting green, golf-driving practice area, fieldhouse, library, and small senior citizen building. Most senior citizens were found in the golf areas, senior building, library and children's areas. Interviewers were instructed to conduct interviews in these areas, but not to the exclusion of other users. The park is located in the northern Marina District, which is a higher economic area, with the majority of users being Caucasian.

HOUSTON

Site 6: Mason Park

This site is located in southeast Houston in a predominately Hispanic area, with many Whites also using the facilities. The largest of the Houston parks studied, with 100 acres, the site includes a recreation center, pool, children's play area, picnic area, horseshoe pits, tennis courts, four ball fields, three soccer fields, and open turf areas. The park is bisected by a bayou and a major thoroughfare. At the time of pilot, the area had been hit by a severe wind storm, causing some tree damage and strewn trash. Most seniors attend dances and programs.

Site 7: Fleming Park

This T-shaped 2.5-acre park is located in the White, middle-class area near Rice University in west central Houston. The site includes tennis courts, a concrete basketball court, softball field, picnic area and children's play area. Most use is of a passive nature.

Site 8: Independence Heights

This 3.1-acre park is located in an all Black middle-and lower middle-class area. The site includes a ball field, basketball court and small children's play area. Most seniors come to the park to participate in a variety of activity and nutrition programs provided in the recreation center.

Site 9: Candlelight Park

Candlelight Park is located in the White middle-class north central area of Houston. The 9.3-acre site receives use by seniors attending activity programs in the recreation center and those who walk dogs or watch grandchildren. In addition to the activity center, there is a ball field, picnic area, and children's play lot. The site is heavily wooded with evergreens.

Site 10: Clark Park

Clark Park is located in the racially-mixed northeast area. Most users are middle-and lower middle-class. The 9.5-acre site includes a basketball shelter, newly completed recreation center, children's play and picnic area, and a combination baseball and football field. Most seniors tend to participate in programs provided in the activity center. This park was also damaged by a wind storm, causing felled branches and much trash.

In general, heat and humidity restrict users to covered inside areas or morning and evening hours throughout the city.

ATLANTA

Site 11: Lang Carson

This new 5-acre site is located in the eastern area of Atlanta. Most residents of the area are middle-to lower-income Blacks. The site includes a new recreation activity building and covered basketball court. Access to the site is restricted to an easement, the park being surrounded by residences, a rail line and business. Most users attend to participate in activities offered in the center.

Site 12: Pittman Park

This 14.1-acre L-shaped park is located in the poor, Black south side. Facilities include a recreation center, athletic fields, children's play and open turf areas. The park is an older, well-established facility.

Site 13: Perkerson Park

Middle income Blacks are the prime users of this 49-acre park, which includes an activity center, tennis courts, athletic fields, children's play area and open spaces developed on a rolling wooded lot.

Site 14: West Manor

West Manor Park is an 11-acre site in a middle- and upper middle-class Black area. Facilities include a recreation activity center, tennis courts, athletic fields, children's play area and open areas. Senior programs are not scheduled in the center; however, older users frequent all areas, especially children's areas.

Site 15: Mozley Park

Mozley Park is a 28.15-acre site in a middle-to low-income Black area. Facilities include an activity center, tennis and outdoor racquetball courts, athletic fields, a pool, children's area, and open turf. Seniors meet at the activity center on Tuesday and Thursday of each week.

CHICAGO

Site 16: Tuley Park

This 20.19-acre park is located in the predominately lower class Black south side. Developed within the facility are 13 tennis courts, a fieldhouse swimming pool, asphalt basketball courts, children's play area and a large multi-purpose athletic field. At the time of piloting the center, the library portion of the fieldhouse was under renovation.

Site 17: Avalon Park

This 27.84-acre park, located in the southeast area, was originally in a White neighborhood. The area is now populated by middle-and upper middle-class Blacks. Site development includes a fieldhouse, swimming pool, running track, asphalt basketball court, large children's play area, two multi-purpose athletic fields, and six tennis courts. The site is accessible from the north boundary street and three easements, one on the east and two on the south. Senior citizen activities are extremely popular, drawing a large number to the fieldhouse on scheduled days.

Site 18: Welles Park

Welles Park is located in the mixed area of the northside. Whites, Blacks, American Indians and others can be seen in the area. Park development includes a swimming pool, fieldhouse, children's play area, three tennis courts, horseshoe pits, baseball diamond with grandstand, an athletic field, and an open turf area on a 15.10-acre site.

Site 19: Shabbona Park

Shabbona Park is located in the White middle-class area of the west side. Development includes a children's play area, a fieldhouse with indoor pool, horseshoe courts, softball and baseball fields, five tennis courts, an athletic field and two bocci courts. Seniors frequent activity programs in the fieldhouse and swim daily in master's swim. A parochial school is located on the west side of the park. Total acreage of the site is 18.59.

Site 20: Hiawatha Park

This triangular-shaped, 12.08-acre park is located in the White middle-class, far west side. Facilities include: a children's play area, fieldhouse, two tennis courts, asphalt basketball court, and multi-use athletic field. Older users attend senior programs in the fieldhouse.

BOSTON

Site 21: Herter Park

Herter Park is a 8.3-acre park located along the Charles River in Brighton, near the Howard University stadium. There are a children's playground, two community garden plots, a wooden dock, and many picnic tables and barbecue grills.

Site 22: Columbus Park

Columbus Park is a large, 57-acre park located in the east South Boston area. Facilities include children's play area, several athletic fields, tennis courts, a recreation building, pool, and several large areas of open turf. The park is surrounded by a ring of major thoroughfares. The neighboring area is mixed with middle-, low-middle, and low-income homes. Several housing projects are nearby, one of which is for senior citizens.

Site 23: Gibson Playground

Gibson Playground is a 4.34-acre park in a business and residential area of Dorchester. Middle-and lower middle-income homes are found throughout the area. The north and east areas near the park are mostly small businesses. The park facilities include a children's play area, athletic fields, and passive recreation areas. The park appeared to be heavily used as seen during pilot testing.

Site 24: The Back Bay Fens

The 113 acres of the Back Bay Fens are located in west Boston and are part of Olmstead's Emerald Necklace. Homes in the area represent middle-income households. Facilities are wide-ranging, including athletic fields, open turf, urban vegetable garden plots, a rose garden, and a series of ponds.

Site 25: Chestnut Hill

Chestnut Hill Park is located in middle-class northwest Boston. The site is located near a reservoir and includes athletic fields, pool, children's play area, and open turf areas in its 33.5 acres.

APPENDIX C - SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

C1____ Interview Number
C2
C3

C4____ Park Identification Number
C5

C6____ Date of Interview
C7
C8

C9 a.m. Time of Interview
C10____ p.m.
C11

C12____ Number of people with interviewee

INTRODUCTION Hello, I'm an interviewer for a study concerning how people use local parks. The study is approved by the ________________ Park and Recreation Department and sponsored by the American Association of Retired Persons. If you're 55 years old or over, you're eligible for our study. The questions take only a few minutes and may help make parks better places for all of us. May I ask you a few questions? IF "NO," thanks just the same. IF "YES," fine. Let's sit down on that bench! IF AGE IN DOUBT, I can only interview those who are age 55 or over. Are you in that category?

First, I'd like to ask you a few questions about this park.

C13____ Q1 Would you say this park is for people of all ages?
1. yes
2. no
3. any other answer________________
4. don't know

C14____ Q2 If no, for whom is the park intended?________________________

C15____ Q3 Of the people who use this park, would you say you personally know none of them, a few of them, some of them, or most of them?
1. none of them
2. a few of them
3. some of them
4. most of them
5. any other answer________________

C16____ Q4 Do you feel comfortable with the other people who use this Park?
1. yes
2. no
3. some of them/sometimes
4. any other answer________________
5. don't know

C17____ Q5 Why do you say that? ______________________________
C18

C19____ Q6 Overall, is this park well-maintained and taken care of?
1. yes 3. any other answer ____________
2. no 4. don't know

C20____ Q7 Why do you think that? ______________________________
C21

C22____ Q8 What do people in your age range like to do when they come here?
C23

C24____ Q9 Do you think this park is safe?
1. yes 4. any other answer ____________
2. no 5. don't know
3. sometimes

C25____ Q10 Why do you think that? ______________________________
C26

C27____ Q11 How often do you come to this park?
C28
1. twice a day or more 2. every day
3. nearly every day 4. a few times a week
5. once a week 6. a few times a month
7. a few times a year 8. don't know
9. other ______________________________

C29____ Q12 Have you used this park in past years?
1. yes 2. no

C30____ Q13 If "yes," how many years? (record actual number)
C31

C32____ Q14 What time of day do you usually come here?
C33

1. early morning (7-10 a.m.)
2. late morning (10-12 a.m.)
3. lunch time (12-1 p.m.)
4. early afternoon (1-3 p.m.)
5. late afternoon (3-5 p.m.)
6. dinner time (5-6 p.m.)
7. early evening (6-8 p.m.)
8. late evening (8-10 p.m.)
9. no usual time--varies
10. any other answer________________________________
11. don't know

C34____ Q15 How long do you usually stay?
C35

1. 1/4 hour or less
2. more than 1/4 hour to 1/2 hour
3. more than 1/2 to 3/4 hour
4. more than 3/4 hour to 1 hour
5. more than 1 hour to 1-1/2 hours
6. more than 1-1/2 hours to 2 hours
7. more than 2 hours to 3 hours
8. more than 3 hours to 4 hours
9. more than 4 hours to 5 hours
10. more than 5 hours
11. no usual length of stay--varies
12. any other answer________________________________
13. don't know

C36____ Q16 (If usual time)--Why do you usually come to the park
C37 at ______?

____

____

____

C38____ Q17 Do you prefer coming to the park on weekdays or weekends?
1. weekdays 3. no preference
2. weekends 4. any other answer________________

C39____ Q18 (If weekdays or weekends)--Why do you prefer coming to the park on ____________________?

____

____

____

C40____ Q19 When you come to the park, do you usually decide to come on the spur of the moment or do you plan your visit in advance?
1. spur of the moment 3. it depends--varies at times
2. plan in advance 4. any other answer________________

C41____ Q20 (If "planned in advance"): How far ahead do you usually plan your park visit?

1. a few hours
2. a day
3. a few days
4. week or more
5. it depends/varies
6. any other answer________________

C42____ Q21 How far do you live from the park?

1. 3 blocks or less
2. 4 blocks to one mile
3. one mile to 2 miles
4. 2 miles to 3 miles
5. 3 miles to 4 miles
6. 4 miles or more
7. any other answer____________
8. don't know

C43____ Q22 How do you usually travel to this park (check all that apply)

1. walk
2. bicycle
3. drive my own car
4. car pool or ride with others
5. taxi
6. bus, subway or trolley
7. other (specify)_________________

C44____ Q23 Do you usually come to the park? (Ask type and number if relevant.)

C45

C46

	How Many Come With You?
1. by yourself	____
2. with a friend	____
3. with a neighbor	____
4. with your spouse	____
5. with your child	____
6. with your grandchild	____
7. it depends/varies	____
8. any other answer_________________	

C47____ Q24 Have you ever thought about why you come to the park? What role does it play in your life?

C48

C49

C50

____

____

____

What else can you tell me about that?

____

____

____

____

C51____ Q25 Do you feel differently about things after you visit the park?

1. yes
2. no
3. any other answer_________________________________

C52____ Q26 (If "yes,") can you describe how you feel after visiting the park?
C53

____

____

____

TRANSITION Next, let's talk about some of the things you do while at the park--and also things you'd like to do.

C54____ Q27 What do you usually do when you come to the park?
C55
C56
C57

____

____

____

Anything else?____

____

____

C58____ Q28 Is there anything you can't do in the park but would like to?
1. yes 3. any other answer______________________
2. no 4. don't know

C59____ Q29 (If "yes,") what would you like to do?______________________
C60

____

____

C61____ Q30 If you could change one thing about this park, what would you change? ____
C62

____

____

C63____ Q31 Why would you change it?____
C64

____

____

____

TRANSITION A final important part of this study is to find out more about the people who use the parks.

C65____ Q32 Sex of respondent (Don't ask--just record)
1. male 2. female

C66____ Q33 Would you say your health was excellent, good, average, below average or poor?

1. excellent
2. good
3. average
4. below average
5. poor
6. any other answer____________________
7. don't know/won't answer

C67____ Q34 What is your present marital status? Are you married, never married, divorced, separated, widowed?

1. married
2. never married
3. divorced
4. separated
5. widowed
6. don't know/won't answer

C68____ Q35 DIRECTIONS Ask only if this is not obvious: Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic status?

1. Black (Negro)
2. White (Caucasian)
3. Mexican-American
4. Puerto Rican
5. Oriental
6. American Indian (Native American)
7. Other (please specify)__________
8. don't know/won't answer

C69____ Q36 Are you presently

1. employed full-time
2. employed part-time
3. retired and not working
4. retired and working part-time
5. unemployed but not retired
6. full-time homemaker
7. don't know/won't answer

C70____ Q37 DIRECTIONS Give age category card to the respondent and ask the following: To which of these age categories do you belong?

1. 56-60
2. 61-65
3. 66-70
4. 71-75
5. 76-80
6. 81-85
7. 86-90
8. 91-over
9. don't know/won't answer

C71____ Q38 DIRECTIONS Give income category card to the respondent
C72 and ask the following: Which of these categories best describes the total income from your household before taxes in 1980?

1. less than $1,000
2. $1,000 to $1,999
3. $2,000 to $2,999
4. $3,000 to $3,999
5. $4,000 to $4,999
6. $5,000 to $5,999
7. $6,000 to $7,999
8. $8,000 to $9,999
9. $10,000 to $11,999

10. $12,000 to $13,999
11. $14,000 to $16,999
12. $17,000 to $19,999
13. $20,000 to $24,999
14. $25,000 to $29,000
15. $30,000 to $39,999
16. $40,000 to $49,000
17. $50,000 and over
18. don't know/won't answer

C73____ Q39 DIRECTIONS Give education category card to the respondent
C74 and ask the following: What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed?

1. no formal education
2. some grade school
3. completed 6th grade
4. some junior high school
5. completed 9th grade
6. some high school
7. completed high school
8. some college
9. completed Bachelor's Degree
10. some graduate work
11. completed Master's or other post-graduate degree
12. other (please specify)________________________________
13. don't know/won't answer

CLOSING This concludes our interview. Thank you very much for your help.

LMs3/2

APPENDIX D - CODING SCHEME - CONDENSED

CODING SCHEME - CONDENSED

Question 5: Why are/aren't you comfortable?

51. Likes or trusts other users 1,5,7,10,11,12,30,39,40
52. Dislikes or distrusts other users 6,15,19,20
53. No evidence of trouble 2,3,4,13,32
54. Evidence of trouble 14,25
55. Good neighborhood 18,22,26,29
56. Bad neighborhood 36
57. Police or friends protect me 16,17
58. Other answer 8,9,21,24,27,28,33,34,35,37,38
59. Don't know 23
60. Missing 00,31

Question 7: Why do you think the park is/isn't well maintained?

61. Positive physical evidence 1,2,3,4,5,9,11,12,21,42,45
62. Negative physical evidence 17,19,20,27,28,30,31,35,36,43,46,47, 48,50,52
63. Observed maintenance workers 10
64. Don't observe maintenance workers 16,23,25
65. Responsible users 13,44
66. Unresponsible users 29,32,37
67. Good neighborhood 41
68. Other answer 6,7,8,14,15,18,22,24,26,34,38,39,49,51
69. Don't know 33
70. No answer 00,40

Question 8: What do people in your age range like to do?

71. Sport/exercise 1,13,16,21,22,26,27,28,33,35,36,45,55,56

72. Non-physical games/hobbies 14,15,17,42,49,50,51,52,63

73. Attend organized Rec programs 9,30,53,54

74. Music--play or listen 8,57,58,61

75. Sitting, watching 2,7,18,19,20,23,29,32,39,40,46,59,60

76. Socialize--family, friends 3,4,5,10,37,47

77. Other answer 6,11,12,25,26,32,35,39,42,45,49,61,63,65,66

78. Don't know 44

79. No answer 00

Question 10: Why do/don't you think the park is safe?

51. Like users 1,3,13,43

52. Dislike users 2,6,8,20

53. No evidence of trouble 4,5,30

54. Evidence of trouble 15,16,18,27,28

55. Police or friends protect me 11,12,36

56. Police or friends don't protect me 7,25

57. Good neighborhood 19

58. Bad neighborhood 17

59. Other answer 9,10,14,21,22,23,26,29,31,32,33,34,35,37,38,40,41,42,44,45

60. Don't know 24

61. No answer 00

Question 26: Describe your feelings after visiting the park

61. Positive (emotional, mental) 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15, 16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,28,30,31,32,33,34,37,38,39,40,43,44,45, 48,50,51

62. Positive (physical) 26,46,49

63. Neutral (emotional, mental) 41

64. Neutral (physical) 5,24,27,29

65. Negative (emotional, mental) 47

66. Negative (physical) 42

67. Other answer 35,36

68. Don't know/no answer 25

Question 16: Why do you come at a usual time?

71. Work related 7,9,10,19,26,27,58,65

72. Park program, facility, or feature related 5,17,23,25,43,54,55,59

73. Being with other people 2,4,15,20,24,37

74. Weather related 11,18,21,38,42,47,48

75. Condition of park better 3,6,22,30,35,52

76. Related to other obligations 1,12,31,56

77. Transportation related 14,60

78. Other answer 8,13,16,28,29,33,34,36,39,40,41,44,45,46,49,50,51, 53,55,57,61,62,63,64,66

79. Don't know/no answer 32

Question 18: Weekday/weekend preference

1. Condition of park better 1,9

2. Being with other people 2,5

3. Park program facility or feature 3

4. Work related

5. Transportation 7,8

6. Only time in area 6

0. Don't know/no answer 0

Question 24: What role does the park play in your life?

87. Socialize, visit 6,8,12,39,54,70,72

88. Relax 3,50,51,56,58,66

89. Enjoy nature 7,15,17,26,33,36,40,42,45,63,67

90. Break or change 4,14,20,22,24,81

91. Participate in specific activity or program 9,11,25,30,46,53,65,75,76,79,80,81

92. Exercise 5,13,31,64,74,78

93. Spectate, watch program 10,29,52,59

94. Business conducted 16

95. Contemplate, solitude 28,47,82,84

96. Other answer 1,2,18,19,23,27,32,34,35,37,38,41,44,48,49,55,57,60,61,68,69,71,72,73,75,76,77,79,80,83,85

97. Don't know/no answer 43,62

Question 27: What do you do while visiting the park?

86. Participate in specific sport activity or exercise 1,17,21,30,31,35,36,47,48,65,66,70

87. Participate in specific non-sport activity 9,10,11,12,13,15,16,18,19,22,23,25,34,37,50,53,54,56,57,58,59,64,67,72,81,84

88. Socialize, visits 2,6,20,27,28,38,44,46,62,85

89. Relax 32,42,43,51,78

90. Enjoy nature 7,8,40,45,49,68,75,77

91. Spectate, watch program 3,29,52,63

8. Other answers 11

9. Don't know/no answer 39

Question 31: Why would you change it?

81. Activity oriented 16,27,30,33,41,48,50,53,59,61,63,72

82. Maintenance oriented 7,13,14,18,19,20,21,28,29,32,42,43,51,57,58

83. Facility oriented 6,8,11,12,24,35,37,38,40,47,52,55,56,65,70

84. Personal, health oriented

85. Other park user oriented 1,3,9,46,49,62,68

86. Safety oriented 2,4,10,23,25,26

87. Policies oriented 15,17,34,39

88. Other answer 31,36,44,45,54,60,64,66,67,69

89. Don't know/no answer 22

LM1/17

92. Conduct business 60,83

93. Eat 5,73

94. Drink 33,41

95. Contemplation, solitude 26,82

96. Other answer 4,39,55,69,71,74,76,79,80

97. Don't know/no answer

Question 29: What would you like to do, but can't?

41. Activity oriented 7,10,14,15,16,18,22,24,26,27,28,31,38,39

42. Maintenance oriented 5,9,17,25

43. Facility oriented 3,4,6,29,33,36

44. Personal health oriented 13,19,21

45. Other park user oriented 1,30

46. Safety oriented 2,11,12

47. Other answer 20,23,32,34,35,37

48. Don't know/no answer 8

Question 30: What would you change about the park?

1. Activity oriented 25,43,44,45,74,76,81,86

2. Maintenance oriented 9,18,19,21,32,33,35,36,37,38,41,42,49,51, 53,54,63,65,66,67,77,78,83,85

3. Facility oriented 2,3,4,8,10,12,13,14,15,17,22,24,28,47,48,52,58, 59,60,61,62,70,71,73,75,80,82,87,88,89,90,92,95,97

4. Personal health oriented

5 Other park users oriented 1,5,6,46,64,84

6. Safety oriented 7,20,27

7. Policy changes 16,26,29,30,31,34,40,50,56,57,68,69,72,77,79,91, 93,94,96

APPENDIX E - CODING SCHEME - EXPANDED

QUESTION 2

WHO PARK IS FOR?

0. No Answer
1. Younger People
2. University Students

QUESTION 5

WHY ARE/AREN'T YOU COMFORTABLE?

1. Recognize Most People
2. Have Not Seen or Heard of Trouble (to Others)
3. No One Bothers Me (Or Us)
4. Everyone Stays to Themselves
5. Everyone Seems Nice, Friendly (Not My Group)
6. Different (Bad) Crowd on Weekends
7. Comfortable with Others in Regular Group (My Group)
8. Parking Problems
9. I Just Do
10. Everyone Seems to Enjoy Themselves
11. I Get Along With Anybody
12. Always Lots of People Around
13. No Reason to Feel Otherwise
14. Has Been Trouble
15. Uncomfortable With People From Projects
16. Because There is Police Patrol
17. Usually Accompanied by a Friend
18. Part of Neighborhood, Good
19. Don't Like Hippies, Hobos, Coloreds, Kids, Or Other Atypical Groups
20. Some Seem Harmless, Others Don't
21. Use Park During "Safe" Hours (Daytime)
22. Park is Improving
23. Don't Know
24. Depends on Weather; Gray-Undesirables, Sunny-Families
25. Uncomfortable When Young People Harass Children

Question 5
Continued

26. Familiar with Area
27. Lots of Space
28. Not Comfortable at Night
29. Good Atmosphere
30. Get Along with Kids
31. No Answer
32. No One Out to Hurt Anyone
33. People Here are my Age
34. Don't Know Many of the People
35. Not Here Very Much
36. Neighborhood Changing
37. Park is for Everyone
38. Certain Parts of Park not Safe
39. Feels Comfortable with College Kids
40. God-Fearing People, God's Children

QUESTION 7

WHY DO YOU THINK THE PARK IS/ISN'T WELL MAINTAINED?

1. Great Compared to other Parks
2. Always Clean: Mowed, Watered, Trimmed
3. Nice Appearance
4. Keep Picked Up
5. Downed Limbs after Storms
6. Trash After Weekends
7. Always Got What we Needed (Program Supplies)
8.
9. Building or Specialized Facility Kept Clean
10. See Maintenance Personnel Working
11. Equipment Nice
12 Well Arranged
13. People Clean Up After Themselves
14. No Dogs Around
15. Broken Benches
16. Never See Anyone Working
17. Not Maintained
18. Dogs at Large
19. Fields Not Marked
20. Fountains Not On
21. Better Taken Care of Than Last Year - Seen Improvement
22. Needs Improvement
23. Under Staffed
24. No Fault Found
25. Budget Cuts

Question 7
Continued

26. Don't Do Good Job
27. Glass in Sandboxes and Elsewhere
28. Too Many Beer Bottles Around
29. Vandalsim
30. Restrooms in Poor Condition
31. Grass Cutting & Trimming, Needed
32. Users Abuse
33. Don't Know
34. Trash Around
35. Over Watered
36. Specific Facility Need Improvement
37. Facility Nice but Groups Aren't
38. Everything seems Fine
39. I Just Do
40. No Answer
41. Good Neighborhood
42. Restrooms are Well Kept
43. Building Poorly Heated
44. Users Help Keep it Clean
45. Courts Maintained
46. Pool Shower Room not Maintained
47. Sometimes Pool is too Cold
48. Need Better Snow Removal
49. Need More Shade Trees
50. Fences Broken
51. Clubhouse not Open
52. Not Maintained as Well as in Past Years

QUESTION 8

WHAT PEOPLE IN AGE RANGE LIKE TO DO?

1. Walk
2. Watch People
3. Picnic
4. Watch Grandchildren
5. Family Occassions
6. Dance
7. Watch Ball Games
8. Listen to Music
9. Classes
10. Socialize/Visit
11. Eat
12. Get out of House
13. Exercise (Other)
14. Work (On Hobbies)/Arts & Crafts
15. Cards
16. Walk Dog
17. Bingo
18. Relax
19. Watch Boats
20.
21. Sit
22. Bicycle
23. Work on Garden
24. Enjoy Sun
25. Go to Beach

Question 8
Continued

26. Read
27. Play Tennis
28. Play Bocci
29. Jog
30. Watch Tennis
31. Attend Senior Programs
32. Get Drunk
33. Enjoy View
34. Practice Golf
35. Go in Library
36. Kung Fu/Martial Arts
37. Tai Chi
38. Discussions
39. Pass Time
40. Rest
41. Watch Girls
42. Get Fresh Air
43. Play Chess
44. Don't Know/Can't Say
45. Enjoy Quiet Place
46. Volleyball
47. Think
48. Play with Children
49. Enjoy Outdoors
50. Play Checkers
51. Indoor Games
52. Play "42", "84"
53. Dominoes

Question 8
Continued

54. Help with Senior Activities
55. Have Special Shows
56. Swim
57. Horseshoes
58. Sing
59. Play Piano
60. Stretch out on Grass
61. Sleep
62. Listen to Radio
63. Not much for Older People to do Here
64. Fish
65. Feed Birds/Ducks
66. Pray

QUESTION 10

WHY DO YOU THINK THE PARK IS SAFE?

1. Lots of Family People
2. Bad Groups in Park on Weekends
3. No Rough Boys Hanging Around
4. Have not Heard of or Seen Trouble/Problems (To Others)
5. No one Bothers Me
6. Kids Hanging Around on Afternoons and Weekends
7. Not Enough Park Police
8. Too Many Mexicans Causing Trouble
9. Not Safe at Night
10. Not Safe on Weekends or at Nights
11. Have Patrol Cars Around
12. Close to Firestation
13. Everyone Keeps to Themselves
14. Rough Ground on Fields
15. Has Had Trouble (Theft, Assult)
16. Vandalism
17. Rough Neighborhood
18. Robberies During Day (To Others)
19. Good Neighborhood
20. Bad Kids/People in Park
21. Not Safe at Certain Hours
22. Not as Popular as other Parks
23. Afraid of Secluded or Certain Areas
24. Don't Know/No Answer
25. Not Secure

Question 10
Continued

26. Safe When not Crowded
27. Others Bothered
28. Has Heard of Trouble
29. No Place is Safe
30. Too Many People for Trouble
31. Safe Compared to Other Parks
32. No Secluded Areas
33. Not Safe to Be Alone
34. Wouldn't Bring Grandchildren here
35. Wouldn't be Here if I didn't Feel it was Safe
36. Well Watched by Personnel
37. Stays Inside
38. Likes the Park
39. Safer than the Streets
40. Looks Fine
41. Well Maintained
42. Could Defend Self
43. Family Park
44. Safe as Anywhere
45. Well Lit

QUESTION 16

WHY COME AT A USUAL TIME?

1. Get out of House
2. Visiting
3. Be Where it's Quiet so can Rest
4. After Grandchildren's Nap
5. Regular Meeting (Program) Time
6. Not Crowded
7. After Work
8. Best Time
9. Lunch Time (Lunch break from Job)
10. After Morning Work done at Home
11. Enjoys Being out Walking at That Time
12. Works into Routine
13. Comes After Lunch
14. When Van Picks me Up
15. When Get Everybody Together
16. No Special Reason
17. See Ball Games
18. Sit in Morning Sun
19. Before Afternoon Work
20. When has Grandchildren
21. Before Gets too Hot
22. No Parking in Afternoon
23. Come Before or After Event Scheduled near Park
24. Everyone Else Comes Then Too
25. When Bocci Courts Open

Question 16
Continued

26. Before going to Lunch
27. Works During Week
28. Walk Dog
29. Passes Thru
30. Enjoys (Prefers) Mornings
31. Babysitting Children
32. Don't Know/No Answer
33. Habit
34. To Picnic Lunch
35. Safest Time
36. After Shopping
37. Meets Friends Then
38. Sit in Sun
39. Late Riser
40. No Rush to Get to Park
42. Better Weather
43. When Center Open
44. Leaves Rest of Day Free
45. Visit Library Before
46. Spends Entire Day
47. Fresh Air
48. Nice Time of Day
49. Exercise Before/After Dinner
50. To Play Cards
51. Watch Kids After School (Play)
52. Tennis Courts are Free
53. Help Prepare for Activities

Question 16
Continued

54. To get Hot Dog when Stand is Open

55. Come for Concerts

56. Come when take Wife to Work

57. After Breakfast

58. Work nights

59. When Pool is open (For Seniors)

60. When they can get ride

61. To Keep from Napping during Day so can Sleep Nights

62. To Break up the Day

63 Has Nothing else to do

64. Play Piano

65. Before Work

66. Early Riser

QUESTION 18

WEEKEND/WEEKDAY PREFERENCE

0. Don't Know-No Answer
1. Crowded, Noisy
2. With Family Members
3. Come for Scheduled Programs/Center Open
4. Other Obligations, Family, Work
5. Best Time, Friends Come
6. Only Time Around Area
7. Passing Through to Event Elsewhere
8. Easier to get to Park
9. Safer

QUESTION 24

WHAT ROLE DOES THE PARK PLAY IN YOUR LIFE?

1. Helps Realize what Lord has Give to Live for, Loving Fellow Man
2. Could not Understand Question
3. Relax
4. Get out of House
5. Exercise
6. Family Occassions
7. Be Outdoors
8. Socialize
9. Dance
10. Entertainment
11. Learning Through a Program
12. Work and Enjoy Self and Others
13. Nice Place to go for Walks
14. Get Away from Office Pressures
15. Listen to Birds
16. Discuss Business, no Interruptions
17. Likes the Trees
18. Enjoyment
19. Keep Busy, Hates being Idle
20. Change of Pace
21. Play Cards
22. Different Place
23. Not Hurried
24. Break in Day
25. Keeps Hobby Going

Question 24
Continued

26. Enjoy Surroundings
27. Place to Cook
28. Sit
29. Watch Ball Games
30. Practice Hitting Golf Balls ✓
31. Safe Place to be, or Run
32. Habit
33. Like a Garden Refuge
34. Benefits Kids
35. Likes Area of Town
36. Like Country
37. Best Place to Spend Retirement
38. Close to Home
39. Friends are Here
40. Fresh Air
41. Pass Time
42. Greenery
43. No (Never Thought About)
44. No Other Place to go
45. Enjoy Sun
46. Dog-Walking ✓
47. Solitude
48. Something to do
49. Very Important to Them
50. Resting Place
51. Refreshing
52. People-Watching
53. Tennis ✓

Question 24
Continued

54. Place to be with Grandkids
55. Recreation
56. Like Therapy
57. Health
58. Peace of Mind
59. Watch Young People
60. Curiosity
61. Close to Activity Outside of Park
62. No Answer
63. View or Scenery
64. Place to Play
65. Picnic ✓
66. Keeps from Worrying about Things
67. Open
68. Passing Through
69. Better than Television
70. Like to Help People
71. Equipment for Grandchildren
72. Community Activities
73. Senior Activities
74. Sports
75. Horseshoes ✓
76. Eat ✓
77. Kills Time
78. Swim ✓
79. Read ✓
80. Get away from it All ✓
81. Sing ✓

Question 24
Continued

82. Place to Think

83. Quiet

84. Brings back Memories

85. Contentment

QUESTION 26

DESCRIBE FEELINGS AFTER VISITING PARK

1. At Peace
2. Relaxed
3. Happy
4. Better Outlook
5. Tired after Dancing
6. Ready for Rest of Day
7. Uplifted
8. Not so Lonely
9. As if in the Country again
10. Glad to be away from the House, Doing Things
11. Refreshed
12. Like Done some Good for Self and Others
13. Soothed
14. Satisfied
15. Less Troubled
16. Accomplishment
17. Comfortable
18. Enjoyed the Day/Self
19. Better
20. "Like Living" when get Home
21. Younger
22. Enjoys Being Around Younger People
23. Away from Confinement at Home
24. Slowed Down
25. No Answer

Question 26
Continued

26. Feels Good (After Exercise)
27. Rested
28. Healthier
29. Tired
30. Grateful
31. Glad to be Outdoors
32. Invigorated
33. Tranquility and Peace
34. Confidence in Friends (Can Depend on Them)
35. Sees Need for more Parks in Area
36. Earned Something
37. Mind Clearer
38. Better about Mankind
39. Best Place in the World
40. Contented
41. "Talked Out"
42. Still Poorly
43. Beautiful
44. Wonderful
45. Different About People
46. Can Take a Nap
47. Sadder
48. Cheerful
49. Cooler
50. Appreciative
51. Thoughtful
52. Prayerful

QUESTION 27

WHAT DO YOU DO WHILE VISITING THE PARK?

1. Walk
2. Visit
3. Watch People
4. Listen to the Radio
5. Eat Lunch
6. Watch, Play, Bring Grandchildren
7. Watch Birds and Feed
8. Enjoy Outdoors
9. Picnic
10. Set up for Dances
11. Dance
12. Look for Cans
13. Craftwork
14. Help out When Can
15. Walk the Dog
16. Play Piano in the Band
17. Get Exercise (Other)
18. Read
19. Church Picnics
20. Work with Senior Citizens
21. Hit Golf Balls
22. Play Cards
23. A Little of all Programs (At Center)
24. Bingo
25. Work on Garden

Question 27
Continued

26. Think about Things
27. Play with Kids
28. Tell Stories
29. Watch Ball Games
30. Run
31. Go to Beach and Swim
32. Nap
33. Drink
34. Crossword Puzzles
35. Play Bocci Ball
36. Take Care of Bocci Courts
37. Use Metal Detector
38. Talk with Park Staff
39. Check for Loiters and Reports to Police
40. Look at View
41. Get Drunk
42. Sit
43. Relax
44. Be with Friends
45. Enjoy Sun
46. Visit Senior Center
47. Bicycle
48. Tennis
49. Fresh Air
50. Play Chess
51. Rest
52. Watch Golfers
53. Look through Trash

Question 27
Continued

54. Ceramics
55. Make Sure Kids don't Hurt Themselves
56. Piece Quilts
57. Paint
58. Dominoes
59. Play "42"
60. Civic Meeting
61. Play Volleyball
62. Look for a Wife
63. Watch Tennis
64. Play Games
65. Sports of all Kinds
66. Play Horseshoes
67. Concert
68. Get Cool
69. Enjoy
70. Swim
71. Pick up Trash
72. Sing
73. Have Coffee
74. Go to Beach
75. Feed Birds
76. Listen to Radio
77. Fish
78. Stand Around

Question 27
Continued

79. Smoke Cigarettes

80. Bring Kids Water

81. Sing

82. Pray

83. Meeting

84. Crochet

85. Bring Someone and Leave at Park

Question 29

WHAT WOULD LIKE TO DO, BUT CAN'T

1. Get the Mexicans Out
2. Come on Weekends (Safer)
3. Cook out if There were Facilities
4. Picnic-No Tables
5. Use Water Fountain
6. Use Senior Center More (Open Only 1 Day per Week)
7. Have Senior Softball
8. No Answer
9. Help with upkeep of Bocci Courts
10. Concerts
11. Take Grandchildren to Playground but Afraid
12. Run dogs without Leashes
13. Play Tennis (Can't due to Health)
14. Ride Bicycles
15. Play Volleyball
16. Plant Flower
17. Put More Trash Cans by Benches
18. Swimming
19. Play Ball (Can't due to Health)
20. Play with Children
21. Athletics (Can't due to Health)
22. Dancing Lessons
23. Have the Classes Outside
24. Have Family Picnics
25. Sit on the Benches

Question 29
Continued

26. More Outdoor Activities
27. Fish
28. Play Horseshoes
29. Have More Swim Hours
30. Meet more Seniors
31. Garden
32. Walk Around Park
33. Open Building
34. Have Senior Center
35. Watch Sports
36. Have Restrooms
37. Be on Grass
38. Corquet
39. Quilt

Question 30

What Would Change?

1. Less Drinking on Sunday
2. More Running Track
3. More Tables & Benches
4. More Shaded Areas
5. Fewer Kids (Roughies) Hanging Round
6. Keep Wetbacks Out
7. More Park Police, Security
8. More Parking
9. Cleaner
10. Make Larger
11. Pleasant as is
12. More Restrooms
13. Add More Garden Plots
14. Add Flowers
15. Wire Fence at Rear of Ball Field
16. Keep Dogs Restricted to Certain Areas or on a Leash
17. Add an Exercise Course
18. Fix Tennis Nets
19. Cut High Grass along River
20. Make Safer at Night
21. Change Basketball Court
22. Install Restrooms
23. Employ More Park Workers
24. Concrete Barriers instead of Metal Fencing in Park Lot
25. Activities for Toddlers

Question 30
Continued

26. Restrict Vehicle Access
27. Rules Enforcer
28. Install Drinking Fountains
29. Open the Restrooms
30. Have Someone to be with Kids
31. Keep Dogs out
32. Remove Trees from View
33. Trim Trees, Bushes in Center
34. Allow Dogs off Leash if Under Control
35. More Trash Cans Near Benches
36. Make Tee Platforms Sturdy and Replace Hoses
37. Tennis Courts need Resurfaced or Painting
38. Remove Tree in Front of My House
39. No Answer
40. Outlaw Bikes, Skateboards and Mo-peds
41. Cleaner Restrooms
42. Better Maintenance
43. More Activities for all Ages
44. Provide Free Entertainment
45. Music & Dancing in Senior Center
46. User Responsibility
47. Build Swimming Pool
48. Install Clubhouse or Pavillion
49. Improve Pathways
50. Noise Restrictions
51. Improve Putting Green
52. Better Design of Children Area
53. Repair Drinking Fountain

Question 30
Continued

54. Add More Tennis Courts
55. Change the Name
56. Keep open Later
57. Add a Pond
58. More Grass Around Play Area
59. Lighted Tennis Courts
60. More Lights all Around
61. Newer Play Equipment
62. Mow More Often
63. Better Participation in Group Activities
64. Keep Picked Up
65. Drainage Problem
66. Repair Tables
67. Have Senior Center Open all Day
68. Keep Ball Players Out on Weekends
69. New Stove
70. Have Special Outdoor Platform for Seniors
71. Heat in Winter for Building
72. Put in a Driving Range
73. New Building
74. More Outdoor Activities
75. Add a Fishing Area
76. More Ball Games for Kids
77. More Heat in Pool
78. No Shampoo in Showers
79. More Swim Time
80. Add Snack Bar

Question 30
Continued

81. More Knitting
82. More Parking Areas
83. Repair Benches
84. Keep Suburban People Out
85. Repair Special Facility
86. Weekly Band Concerts
87. Add Horseshoe Pits
88. Add Bike Racks
89. Get Rid of Kevin White (Boston Mayor)
90. Build Fence around Garden
91. Open Rose Garden on Weekends
92. Add Exercise Equipment
93. Walk inside Reservoir
94. Move Men away from Ceramics Area
95. More Space in Center
96. Make Sure get in on Time
97. Air Conditioning, Ventilation

QUESTION 31

WHY WOULD YOU CHANGE IT?

1. Drinking no Good. People Enjoy Trail
2. Too Hot for Elderly to Sit in the Sun
3. Kids Hanging Around, Drinking Leads to Trouble
4. Make a Neighborhood Park, Safe for Families on Weekends
5. Things aren't Good
6. No Place to Park
7. Place would be Nicer to Come
8. Should Have Decent Place to Park
9. No Need Having Trouble Makers Around
10. Make Place Safer
11. Can't Find Restrooms, Only one
12. Not Enough Garden Plots
13. Make Prettier
14. Keep Park Cleaner
15. Keep Vehicles Out
16. Adequate Programs for Kids
17. Too Many Loose Dogs
18. Restrooms Dirty and Small
19. Trash Cans too Far Away
20. Tree Blocks View and is Dirty
21. Too much Time
22. No Answer
23. Dangerous
24. Place to get a Drink of Water
25. More Police Control
26. Cut Down Vandalism
27. Family Picnics

Question 31
Continued

28. Better Maintenance
29. Trees Too High
30. Keep Kids Occupied
31. Lift Everyone's Spirits
32. Make Restrooms Usable
33. Entertainment to Pass Time
34. Leashes for Dogs/Under CONTROL
35. No Pool Closeby
36. Better Use
37. No Place to Sit
38. Need a Shelter
39. Name Keeping with Neighborhood
40. Lighted Tennis Courts for Evening Use.
41. Better Group Participation so Old People will be Less Lonely
42. Mosquitoes due to poor Drainage
43. Takes Long Time to Dry after Rain
44. Keep Place as Nice as it is
45. More time to Spend with Friends
46. Baseball Players Mess Place Up
47. Special Pavillion for Seniors so Young "Can't Take Over"
48. Music More Entertaining than Watching
49. Benefit Children
50. So We Can Play Golf
51. Building Smells Bad
52. Tennis Courts Overcrowded
53. Enjoys Parade Music
54. Have to Travel too Far for Field Trips
55. Need more Room

Question 31
Continued

56. A Place to Fish/like to fish
57. Can't Lay on Grass When Dogs Mess there
58. No Shampoo in Shower so People Won't Slip
59. So We Can Swim More
60. For Better Enjoyment
61. So We Can Have More Activities for Seniors
62. So Kids Won't Ruin Grounds
63. Encourage Exercise
64. Place to Meet People
65. Place to Buy Refreshments
66. Recreation
67. Less Noisy
68. Prevent Kids from Stealing
69. Not Interested in Basketball
70. No Ventilation
71.
72. Start Program on Time

APPENDIX F - INTERVIEWER'S SAMPLING AND PHOTOGRAPHY INSTRUCTIONS

INTERVIEWER'S SAMPLING AND PHOTOGRAPHY INSTRUCTIONS

Sampling Instructions

Interviewers should circle the park at a distance approximately equa-distant from the center and the edges, interviewing anyone in the line of site.

Interviewers are encouraged to interview potential respondents engaged in activities. It may be necessary to make arrangements to return to conduct the interview at a mutually convenient time, say during a break or at the end of the activity.

Potential respondents in groups or engaged in activities, especially in specialized facilities, should not be ignored.

Selecting which of two or more persons to interview when they are together can be accomplished by assigning a number to each person who appears to be 55 and over and choosing one respondent by referring to a table of random numbers.

Respondents who indicate that they have never visited the park before should not be interviewed. Be sure to thank them anyway.

It is important that interviewers not avoid potential respondents on the basis of race or ethnic identity.

Length of Time on Site

Interviews must be conducted on both weekends and week days, with 50% on each. Interviews should also be split 50-50 between morning and afternoon, with no interviews after 7:00 p.m.

Potential Problems

In the event of rain there will likely be few respondents and interviewing will be difficult; best to leave site and return when weather clears.

Cold Weather - Interviews should not be attempted if the temperature is below 60^{o}.

No Respondents - Occasionally a site will be void of potential respondents. The park should be left if no respondents arrive within a reasonable period of time, no more than one hour.

If situation persists for three attempts, at least one of which occurs during a weekend, the consultant should be advised and a site reassignment made.

There is no consideration with regard to number of male respondents in proportion to female respondents.

Instructions for Assorted Problems

No Respondents - See Sampling Procedures.

Rain - See Sampling Procedures - Cold Weather.

Identification - Interviewers may occasionally be asked to furnish identification. The letter of introduction from the City Park and Recreation Authority should be shown.

Emergencies:

Respondent Illness - Notify emergency service in community, e.g. 911, extend no care beyond that which you are capable and necessary to maintain vital functions. Notify consultant.

Harassment and/or Assault - Avoid any potential confrontation. In event of any injury or theft, immediately notify authorities and consultant.

Loss of Instruments or Packet - Notify authorities in consideration of possible recovery. Notify consultant immediately for reissue of materials.

Illness - In the event that you are unable to conduct interviews, a similar day should be substituted; that is, week day for week day, weekend day for weekend day.

Obscure Answers - See Checklists for Interviewers. Occasionally answers will be obscure; try to make some sense of it and record faithfully. Under no circumstances should a statement such as "Answer Unintelligible" be recorded. Politely ask respondent to repeat answer or elaborate.

Difficult or Probing Questions by Respondents - See Stock Answers to anticipate questions in Interviewer Guidelines.

Refusals - Do not press for chance to interview a person. Simply say thank you and move on.

Refusal to Answer Certain Questions - Do not press beyond asking once. Simply move on to the next question.

Faulty or Misleading Responses - A determination to terminate an interview may be necessary in the event of obviously misleading responses. If this becomes clear prior to completion, say "This concludes the interview, thank you for your time" and move on.

Voice Level - Be aware of the possibility of someone being hard of hearing. This may be indicated by an inclined ear. Normally, persons with hearing amplification can be addressed in a normal tone of voice.

Termination by Respondent - In the event that the respondent terminates the interview, no attempt should be made at reestablishing communication. Note point of termination on instrument and any reason given, then move on.

Twice Interviewed Subjects - There is the possibility of a respondent being approached twice in those parks handled by two interviewers. Every attempt should be made to avoid this.

Don't Know Responses - See Guidelines for Interviewers.

Wandering Respondents - Respondents may digress from time to time. Interviewers should firmly bring them back to the subject and move on.

Always be aware of potentially contradictory answers. Should an earlier question be answered one way and a subsequent, similar question be answered differently, refer the respondent to the earlier answer, ask for clarification, and recode the first response if necessary.

Also, respondents may later think of something they would like to say in response to an earlier question. Be aware of this possibility and encourage their comments, then be sure to note the response under the proper question.

Remember that you should be in charge of the interview situation at all times. Do not, for example, allow the respondent to wander from the subject or allow accompanying persons to be consulted or to answer.

Photography Instructions

Twenty illustrative slides will be necessary from each park visited by the interviewer. The following is a brief explanation of the types of pictures desired, picture content, composition and instructions for keeping a film log.

Types of Pictures - Kodachrome Slide Film, ASA 64, should be used in all cases, and be taken with a 35 mm camera. If a 35 mm camera is not available, an instamatic 126 may be substituted. Please try to avoid using 110 cameras as the finished slide will be too small.

Interviewers will be furnished with or reimbursed for film. Developing will be handled by the Project Directors.

Content of Pictures - The purpose of the slides is to illustrate responses given by persons interviewed.

Pictures of those activities cited as the reason for park visitations would be one example. Similarly, reasons cited for not participating in certain activities should be cited, maintenance problems, vandalism, or unruly youngsters, for example.

Pictures may not be of older people only. If youth are referred to, visual documentation would be useful. Pictures of broken glass, trash, or vandalism should be included if these are part of respondent answers.

Permission - Ask individuals or small groups of people if they will permit a photograph. Please respect subjects' rights to privacy. You may indicate that pictures will be used as part of the study and will help to illustrate some of the findings.

Use of Film Log - Each notebook contains three film logs, each of which has a code. This code number should be recorded on the film cassette as soon as the film is removed from the camera. Some cassettes may be written on directly; others, particularly 35 mm cassettes may require attaching adhesive tape and writing on it.

Please indicate the name of the park in the space provided.

Each of the 20 frames per roll has been numbered down the left side of the page. After each picture is taken, please record the subject and why the picture was taken. Your reason may be a short explanation or it may refer to a particular response. If the latter, please include the instrument code number and the question number.

Example

15. Vandalism in Restrooms Inst. #765, Q5 & Q6

Please make every attempt to faithfully log each picture, as it is the only way the Project Directors can determine why you included a particular picture.

Hints on Composition and Lighting

Pictures of people are easy to take, so long as you remember to frame head and toe. An amateur photographer's normal inclination is to photograph people by centering on the face. The usual result is people only half there. Center your subjects about waist high, then check the edges of your view finder to be sure feet and tops of heads are included. A step back may be necessary to include all of the subject(s) in the field of view.

Photos of inanimate subjects may also present some difficulty. Be sure to include enough of the subject that the viewer can make sense of it. Also try to include something of a known scale to allow viewers to judge the size of your subject. A coin, piece of park equipment, even blades of grass, add some sense of scale to the picture.

Lighting may also present you with some problems. Some common sense rules should be of some help.

- Always try to have the sun somewhere in the 180° behind you.

- Avoid photographing while standing in the sun and subjects are in the shade, or vice versa.

- Flash pictures will probably be unnecessary, however, comments regarding indoor or naturally shaded areas may require flash.

DKM4/3

APPENDIX G - ITEMS AND Z-SCORES GREATER OR LESS THAN CORRESPONDING ARRAY Z'S

ITEMS AND Z-SCORES
GREATER OR LESS THAN CORRESPONDING
ARRAY Z'S

Type 1 Items greater than all others	Z=SCORE	AVERAGE OF OTHER Z'S	DIFF (Z=Z AVE)
9. I usually plan my visit to this park in advance	1.135	=0.177	1.312
10. I live more than 1 mile from the park	0.784	=0.216	0.999
8. I usually stay here more than 3 hours	0.561	=0.308	0.868
7. I usually come to this park in the morning	0.259	=0.546	0.805
1. I personally know most of the people who use this park	=1.052	=1.238	0.186
14. I visit the senior center when I come to the park	=1.205	=1.347	0.141
4. I think this park is safe	1.179	1.048	0.132
Type 1 Items less than all others	* * * *	* * * *	* * * *
13. I feel better after I visit the park	=1.205	0.540	=1.745
12. I feel differently about things after I visit the park	=1.205	0.591	=1.796

Type 2 Items greater than all others	Z=SCORE	AVERAGE OF OTHER Z'S	DIFF (Z=Z AVE)
11. I usually come to the park by myself	1.292	=0.970	2.263
5. I come to this park nearly everyday	0.364	=0.889	1.252
6. I have used this park in the past year	1.602	0.939	0.663
2. I feel comfortable with the other park users	1.428	1.112	0.316
15. I feel there is something I can not do in this park	=1.080	=1.224	0.144
Type 2 Items less than all others	* * * *	* * * *	* * * *
3. I think this park is well-maintained	0.640	0.937	=0.297
8. I usually stay here more than 3 hours	=0.753	0.349	=1.102
10. I live more than 1 mile from the park	=0.914	0.634	=1.548
9. I usually plan my visit to this park in advance	=1.117	0.949	=2.066

Type 3 Items greater than all others	Z=SCORE	AVERAGE OF OTHER Z'S	DIFF (Z=Z AVE)
12. I feel differently about things after I visit the park	1.044	=0.534	1.579
13. I feel better after I visit the park	0.905	=0.515	1.421
3. I think this park is well-maintained	0.974	0.769	0.205
Type 3 Items less than all others	* * * *	* * * *	* * * *
4. I think this park is safe	1.044	1.115	=0.071
1. I personally know most of the people who use this park	=1.273	=1.127	=0.145
15. I feel there is something I can not do in this park	=1.280	=1.123	=0.157
14. I visit the senior center when I come to the park	=1.406	=1.246	=0.160
2. I feel comfortable with the other park users	1.044	1.304	=0.259
6. I have used this park in the past year	0.698	1.391	=0.693
7. I usually come to this park in the morning	=0.759	=0.037	=0.721
5. I come to this park nearly everyday	=1.169	=0.122	=1.046
11. I usually come to the park by myself	=1.208	0.280	=1.488